A

HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL COMMENTARY

ON

THE OLD TESTAMENT,

WITH

A NEW TRANSLATION

BY

M. KALISCH, Phil. Doc., M.A.

Shemot

שמות—EXODUS.

LONDON:
LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN AND LONGMANS.
1855.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY J. WERTHEIMER AND CO.,
CIRCUS PLACE FINSBURY CIRCUS.

PREFACE.

Almost marvellous is the progress which the Biblical sciences have made since the beginning of this century; it amounts to a total regeneration, and comprises nearly all branches of sacred literature. The knowledge of the holy tongue has been materially promoted by the profoundest grammatical and lexicographical researches; the vigorous study of Biblical history has facilitated our insight into the organic connection of the different books; whilst the critical analysis of universal history has disclosed the natural relation of the people of Israel with the other nations of antiquity; a host of eminent travellers have explored the geography of the East; have made us familiar with the customs of the Oriental nations; and have described many usages and institutions, which enable us correctly to understand numerous obscure Biblical passages and allusions.

However, all these efforts have hitherto remained isolated; no attempt has been made to unite them in one focus, and to bring them into immediate application on the exposition of the sacred books; the existing English Commentaries are mostly without the refreshing and animating breath of modern science; they are essentially composed of antiquated materials; they cannot entirely satisfy the educated or the learned reader, for the spirit of our time is that of progress and historical disquisition. It is the aim of the present work to attempt that amalgamation of modern enquiries; in the simplest possible form we have endeavoured to illustrate the sacred text in its various relations, and thus systematically to prepare the way for a more comprehensive penetration into the spirit of the Biblical records.

That such undertaking is really an urgent desideratum, is confirmed by the following remarks of the Rev. S. Davidson (in *Kitto's* Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature, i. p. 455),

who, speaking of "those English Commentaries which are most current among us," observes: "By a series of appended remarks, plain statements are expanded; but wherever there is a real perplexity, it is glozed over with marvellous superficiality. It may be that much is said *about* it, but yet there is no penetration beneath the surface; and when the reader asks himself what is the true import, he finds himself in the same state of ignorance as when he first took up the Commentary in question. *Pious reflections*, and *multitudinous inferences* enter largely into our popular books of exposition. They *spiritualize*, but they do not *expound*. They *sermonize* upon a book, but they do not catch its spirit, or comprehend its meaning. All this is out of place. A *preaching*, *spiritualizing* Commentary does not deserve the appellation of *Commentary* at all. . . . Our popular commentators piously descant on what is well known, leaving the reader in darkness, where he most needs assistance." The intelligent student may decide, if we have succeeded in avoiding a similar censure.

But modern criticism also has its defects; like every new principle, it has been pursued with one-sided rigour; the desire of consistency has led to extremes. The treasures of the old, especially the Jewish commentators, were neglected; the positive basis was deserted; every traditional conception was rejected as a prejudice and an illusion. The sacred records were dismembered, transposed, falsified; the most aerial conjectures were framed; and the palm was awarded to those, who excelled the rest in boldness and fanciful theories. Instead of penetrating into the notions of the Bible, these critics forced upon it ideas which were nothing but the emanations of their individual preconceptions; and instead of commenting with calm examination, violence and destruction were their constant weapons. Can it cause astonishment, that under such hands the spirit of the holy books vanished, and that the most venerable documents were degraded to an aggregate of contradictions, enigmas, and singularities? It has been our careful endeavour to avoid these extremes; we have disregarded none of the more important ancient commentators; we have tried to produce an equilibrium between the faith of former ages and the science of our century; we have examined without prepossession; and have pre-

served whatever seemed fit to contribute to the true elucidation of the sacred word.

Hence follows a third feature of our commentary. As truth is its only aim, and impartiality its only guide; it is perfectly unsectarian; it does not labour to defend the doctrines of any particular creed; the holy text is its exclusive basis, and the most probable meaning of its contents its sole object. The author has striven, to the utmost of his power, to keep himself above the parties, impressed with the conviction that this is the only safe method of gradually reconciling the conflicting opinions, and of promoting harmony and true brotherly love among the different sects of society. He trusts to have excluded no class of readers; clergymen and laymen, students of history and pious readers, he hopes, will consult the book not without interest and advantage.

But in order to secure this end with greater certainty, he has based his commentary, not upon an existing translation, but on the Hebrew text itself; he has gone back to the source, and hopes thereby to have avoided numerous current errors. Everybody willingly acknowledges the excellencies of the authorised English version; but so vast is the progress of Hebrew philology since the time of its preparation, that a thorough revision has become almost indispensable; and so deeply felt is this requirement, that societies have been formed to meet it. We have, therefore, deemed it necessary to add to our commentary a new translation, which embodies the results of our enquiries, and upon which we have bestowed a due share of attention. Those renderings of the English Version, which we consider as erroneous conceptions, have been noted at the foot of our translation. But it is admitted, with equal unanimity, that the language of the English Version is frequently obsolete, and not seldom obscure and unintelligible; we have altered such passages, without, however, destroying the old venerable hue; we have designedly preserved a colouring of antiquity.

Lastly, in order to facilitate the study of the holy language, without which a deep understanding of the sacred books is impossible, we have not only added the Hebrew text in a correct form, but have grammatically analyzed it in all difficult passages, with a constant regard to the etymological derivation of the words.

For those who are not acquainted with the Semitic and classical languages, we have published a smaller edition, which, besides the new translation, contains an abridged commentary, omitting everything which might be deemed superfluous by the general reader. But, for the man of science, even if he cultivates other branches than Oriental literature, we should recommend this larger edition, in which he will find the necessary references and a statement of the sources.

We have commenced with the publication of the Second Book of the Pentateuch, because it forms the centre of Divine revelation, and because it is best calculated to convey a correct idea of the spirit and tendency of our Commentary; we have treated the explanation of the Mosaic laws with more copiousness than is the case in the existing Commentaries; for it is by its laws that the people of Israel was distinguished from all the other nations; by its theology it became the holy, the chosen people; whilst by its manners and customs it is only a member in the common family of the Oriental nations (see pp. vii. viii). The commentary on Genesis will follow next, and then the other books in due order.

The author, by observing, in conclusion, that he has endeavoured to sum up, as it were, the previous researches, in order to promote, however modestly, the Biblical exegesis, by calm and impartial combinations, has, at the same time established his claim to the indulgent examination of the learned public; he has undertaken the arduous work, strengthened by his love for the sacred and earliest sources of human civilization; and he willingly confides it to the benign protection of Divine grace.

M. KALISCH.

London, June 1st., 1855.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1.—IMPORTANCE, NAME, CONTENTS, DIVISION, AND UNITY OF EXODUS.

1. THE history of Israel, and the progress of Divine Revelation to Israel and to mankind, constitute the two cardinal points of interest in the records of the Old Testament. Prophecy itself is but a compound of those two elements, for it is either prospective and anticipative history, or an exhortative comment on the spirit of the Divine Law. But in no part of the Sacred Volume are those two ingredients so obviously and so completely combined as in the Second Book of the Pentateuch. For whilst Genesis treats of the lives of the Hebrew *patriarchs*, Exodus narrates the fates of the Hebrew *nation;* the former contains chiefly *biographies*, the latter *history;* the one has more an *archæological*, the other a purely *historical* interest; the one is the *promise*, the other the *fulfilment.*[1] Genesis has in every respect the character of an *introduction;* it teaches the existence, the omnipotence of God, but discloses not His essence, defines not His internal nature in its abstraction; it proclaims, at least indirectly, the unity of God, but only in so far as He is the Lord and Ruler of Nature; it implies many principles of morality and human and divine right, but it does not comprize them in a system, or consider them from one common and ideal point of view; it contains the conclusion of a covenant, but its sign and symbol is mysterious and external; it therefore *prepares* us for the sublime notions of sanctity, and religious life, but it does not develop them in their ennobling consequences, it does not ensure their practical effect upon the conduct of man by other and more efficacious institutions; it records revelations, but they are restricted to individuals—they refer to

[1] Comp. Gen. xv. 13—16, and Exod. xii. 40.

the future rather than the present; they are more abrupt and desultory manifestations than a permanent, ever ready, perfect communion; they are more important for the hopes and prospects which they open than for the immediate bliss they confer; they are a veil through which the first outlines of the world's history are dimly discernible. Genesis leads the thread of narration to that very point where the *family* begins to assume the importance, not of a *tribe*, but of a *people;* and Exodus carries on the account through the infancy and youth of the new nation; through the ignominy of Egyptian servitude, and the glory of heaven-wrought redemption; through the darkness of idolatrous aberration, and the light of revealed truth; the Israelites, physically and mentally released, are trained for the difficult warfare against opposing nations, and for a happy political existence in their own conquered land. But the *political* government of Israel is based on, or is rather indentical with, its *religious* organization; it is a *theocracy*,[1] therefore our book contains also a full outline of the moral laws which man owes to God and to his fellow-creatures; and so admirable is their purport and so systematical their arrangement, that they form the eternal and infallible standard of human conduct.[2] The Decalogue and the "Book of the Covenant," embodied in Exodus, render it with respect to Divine revelation, the most important volume which the human race possesses.

2. It is known that the name *Exodus* (*Ἔξοδος*, *departure*, viz., from Egypt) was given to our book by the Hellenists, from the chief event therein narrated, whilst the Jews designate it by the two Hebrew words with which it commences וְאֵלֶּה שְׁמוֹת (*We-eleh Shemoth*) or simply שְׁמוֹת (*Shemoth*).

3. The contents of the Second Book of Moses, which we have constantly developed in the Summaries before each chapter or section, inclose an extraordinary variety of matter, and yield to the enquiring mind an unusual extent of information. The narration of the fates of Israel yields ample and copious results for historical and chronological researches; the ten plagues, for the natural phenomena of the East; the Exode, and the journeys of the Hebrews, for geographical enquiries; the Decalogue, and the laws

[1] See note on xix. 6.
[2] See notes on xx. 1—14, and prefatory remarks to xx. 19, 20.

of the Book of the Covenant, for the most fertile philosophical and legislatorial investigations; and the construction of the holy Tabernacle, and the sacred utensils, not only for the history of art and mechanical skill, but also for the innermost character of the religious ideas of Mosaism. This book is, therefore, as interesting for the diversity, as it is important for the sublimity, of its contents.

4. Exodus may conveniently be divided into two chief portions:—

I. The *Historical* Part: i.—xi. (Israel in Egypt); xii. 21—42, 51. (Exode); xiii. 17—xix. 25. (Journeys and Wanderings to Mount Sinai); xx. 15—18. (Divine Revelation); xxiv. (Covenant concluded between God and Israel); xxxii—xl. (Its violation by the worship of the golden calf and its renewal; the erection of the Tabernacle and the inauguration of Aaron and his sons).

II. The *Legislative* Part: xii. 1—20, 43—50. (Abib appointed as the first month; Passover); xiii. 1—16. (Sanctification of the Firstborn and Phylacteries); xx. 1—14. (Decalogue); xx. 19. to xxiii. 33. (The Book of the Covenant); xxv.—xxxi. (Tabernacle and Sacerdotal Robes).

It will be seen that the first part of Exodus is predominantly historical; the second essentially legislative or dogmatical; but yet the former contains three important *laws;* and the latter, the *history* of a flagrant breach, on the part of Israel, of the promises made concerning the faithful observance of the Law, the erection of the holy Tabernacle, and the consecration of Aaron and his descendants.

5. The authenticity of Exodus has been less exposed to the attacks of criticism than that of the other books of the Pentateuch, especially Genesis. Even the most radical sceptics have admitted that a historical kernel lies at the bottom of the accounts concerning the Exode, and that Moses is the author at least of the Decalogue. It is generally admitted, that both the details of the Egyptian plagues and the journeys of Israel manifest the most accurate acquaintance with the phenomena and localities described. And that rare unanimity makes again this book one of the most interesting parts of the holy records.

But its unity has been questioned, not only by that school of Biblical critics which dismembers the sacred writings, quite as arbitrarily and blindly as many hypercritical philologists of the last century dissected Homer's songs into incoherent fragments; but even more moderate interpreters believe that our book is disfigured by spurious interpolations. We have in all such passages tried to refute this very questionable opinion. *We see the completest harmony in all parts of Exodus; we consider it as a perfect whole, pervaded throughout by one spirit and the same leading ideas.* As it is one of the chief objects of this commentary to prove that unity, we content ourselves here with referring, among other passages, to our notes on vi. 10, 26.; xi. 1.; xii. 1.; xvi. 35, 36.; xxiv. 1. But to show how precarious and fluctuating such dismemberment is, we will only allude to one recent instance.

Staehelin[1] supposes the Pentateuch to contain two different legislations, composed at different times and by different authors, and asserts:—1st. That the one legislation contradicts the other; and, 2nd, that the phraseology in both is different. As to the first point, we refer, besides the notes above quoted, to our remarks on xiii. 2. (about the firstborn), and xxi. 7—11. (about female slaves), where we have reconciled the apparent contradictions; and as to the second objection, it is sufficient to mention that Staehelin considers the use of וידבר instead of ויאמר, of הקים ברית, of בית אבות, of גר and אזרח as conclusive criteria of the first legislation; and the application of the infinitive absolute, of מלאך ה׳, of the phrases "flowing with milk and honey," and "the strong hand of God," as the distinguishing characteristics of the second legislation. It is superfluous to point to the utter groundlessness of such proofs, as all these phrases have no peculiar character applicable exclusively to one time or one individual.

If really our book should, in some parts, have a fragmentary character, this would be far from proving a plurality of authors; it is, on the contrary, in perfect harmony with the nature of a historical work, the single events of which are recorded by a contemporary writer immediately after their occurence. In such cases we

1 *Kritische Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch*, etc. p. 27.

cannot expect a pragmatical digest of the historical facts; and that peculiarity which has been described as a defect in style and composition, constitutes certainly a strong proof of the truth and authenticity of the events narrated.

§ 2. THE CHRONOLOGY OF EXODUS.

The chronology of the period comprised in Exodus, is, like almost all other epochs of Biblical history, involved in intricate and embarrassing difficulty; and it is by the most persevering patience only that we might at last succeed to bring the events related in our book in harmony both with each other and with profane history.

I. SOJOURN OF THE ISRAELITES IN EGYPT.

1. The cardinal point of this important question is: how long did the Israelites stay in Egypt? or, how many years elapsed from the immigration of Jacob to the Exodus under the leadership of Moses? If we follow the clear Biblical representation, we find that the period is *prophetically* fixed at 400 years (Gen. xv. 13), and *historically* stated, in more accurate figures, at 430 years (Exod. xii. 40). But that Biblical statement is surrounded with perplexing difficulties. For, 1st. Kohath (the son of Levi), who was already born at the period of the immigration (Gen. xlvi. 8, 11), lived 133 years (Exod. vi. 18); Amram, his son, attained the age of 137 years (vi. 20); Moses was 80 years old at the time of the Exodus (vii. 7). Now all these numbers added (133 + 137 + 80) give only the sum of 350 years, which must still be considerably shortened by deducting the age of Kohath before the immigration and the contemporary years of the fathers and the sons. 2nd. Levi died at the age of 137 years; at the time of the immigration into Egypt he must have been between 40 and 50 years old (according to Abarbanel on ii. 1—44 years); he lived, therefore, still 93 years in Egypt (137 − 44 = 93); Jochebed might have been born to him in his advanced age, say 80 years after the immigration;[1] and as Moses was 80 years at the time of the Exodus, Jochebed bore him at the age of 270 years! for 430 − (80 + 80) = 270, which would imply an absurdity.—To remove these diffi-

[1] See note on i. 5.

culties, which have already been felt at a very early period of Biblical exegesis, it has been asserted, by almost all Rabbinical interpreters, that the 430 years include the time from the revelation of God to, and His covenant with, Abraham, as related in Genesis xv., and their computation is as follows:—between that revelation (or the departure of Abraham from Chaldea), and the birth of Isaac lies a period of 25 years (compare Gen. xii. 4. and xvii. 1, 21); Isaac was 60 years old when Jacob was born (Gen. xxv. 26); Jacob had attained his 130th year when he immigrated into Egypt (Gen. xlvii. 9); so that these extreme points make a period of 215 years (25 + 60 + 130); and the sojourn in Egypt also is limited to 215 years (430 − 215). See Rashi on Gen. xv. 13, and Exod. xii. 40. This device was already adopted by the Septuagint version (Codex Vaticanus), which renders Exod. xii. 40. thus: *Ἡ δὲ παροίκησις τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, ἣν παρῴκησαν ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν γῇ Χαναὰν, ἔτη τετρακόσια τριάκοντα,* "But the sojourning of the children of Israel, during which they dwelt in Egypt *and in the land of Canaan* was 430 years." The Samaritan text expresses this sense still more distinctly: "and the sojourn of the children of Israel *and of their fathers* (ואבתם) *in the land of Canaan and* in the land of Egypt, was 430 years;" and this reading is literally adopted in the Alexandrian codex of the Septuagint. And so that verse is paraphrased by Targum Jonathan also: "and the days which the children of Israel stayed in Egypt were thirty times seven years (תלתין שמטין דשנין), that is, 210 years; but 430 years had elapsed from the time, when God spoke to Abraham, on the 15th day of Nisan, between the dissected parts of the animals" (Gen. xv. 10—14).[1]

Now, against these alterations of the Samaritan and Septuagint versions, which have, no doubt, *the same source*,

[1] See also Galat. iii. 17; Augustin, Quæst. in Exod. xii. 40; Deyling, Obss. i. p. 69; Ebn Ezra, Rashbam, Nachmanides, Kennicott, Clarke and many others *ad locum*. Hales (Chron. II. i. 200) calls these insertions "absolutely necessary to adjust the chronology of this period." Josephus computes, in one passage (Antiq. II. xv. 9), the 430 years from the emigration of Abraham into Canaan, assigning 215 years to the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, whilst in two other passages (Antiq. II. ix. 1; and Bell. Jud. V. ix. 4) he says distinctly, that the sufferings of the Hebrews in Egypt lasted 400 years. Other variations in Hebrew manuscripts, all with the same end and to a similar effect, have been enumerated by Kennicott; but they are so obviously intentional corruptions of the text, that it is unnecessary to notice them.

we observe:—1. That the context in the twelfth chapter of Exodus, where the history of the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt is concluded, and their departure thence related, can logically only admit of a statement concerning their stay *in that country*, irrespective of their previous sojourning in Canaan. 2. That the oldest and most authentic manuscripts of the Septuagint do not contain the addition of the words "and in the land of Canaan."[1] 3. That it is not only arbitrary, but extremely objectionable, to suppose a corruption of the sacred Hebrew text in two passages on such an important point; and especially, 4. That if we even adopt that interpolation, the difficulties are only changed, but not removed or lessened. For the oppressive measures of the Egyptian king for checking the increase, and annihilating the energies, of the Israelites, must have commenced at least 100 years before the Exodus, because Moses was then 80 years old, and already a considerable time before his birth, the cruel policy of the king had been carried into effect. Now, is it in any way probable, that a family of 69 persons should, in not more than about 100 years, increase to a nation so formidable as to make the powerful king of a great monarchy tremble at the idea of their possible resistance? Not all the aggregate circumstances enumerated in our note on xii. 40 are sufficient to account for such an unparalleled numerical augmentation.

2. The unbiassed and calm critic, will, in this dilemma, not hesitate long in arriving at a determined conclusion; he must necessarily decide in favour of 430 years, as the period of the stay of the Israelites in Egypt, because this number is clearly and unmistakably stated in the sacred text. Thus, not only had the Israelites time to grow into a nation, but the tribes of Canaan, at the time of Jacob still weak, scattered and little numerous, could become powerful, well-organized and populous states. But how are the difficulties attending this statement to be removed? The easiest method to effect this, is to suppose, that in the genealogies of the tribe of Levi, as of all other tribes, not all his progeny is individually enumerated, but those only of his descendants who became conspicuous or important in the succeeding events. From this point of view, several intermediate generations between Kohath and Amram

[1] See *Rosenm.*, Schol. I. ii. p. 222.

have been omitted; for a dry enumeration of their mere names, even if they had not fallen into oblivion, could have no interest for the historian or the general reader. We take, therefore, Exod. ii. 1, in accordance with the Septuagint version:—"And there was one of the tribe of Levi, who took one from the daughters of Levi to wife" (*Ἦν δέ τις ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Λευὶ, ὃς ἔλαβεν ἐκ τῶν θυγατέρων Λευί*), or with the Vulgate: (Egressus est post haec vir de domo Levi et accepit uxorem stirpis suae); and the account in vi. 20, that Jochebed was the aunt of Amram (דֹּדָתוֹ) is hereby in no way affected, because both the daughter of Levi, and any one of her descendants, might have borne the name of Jochebed; whilst the promise in Gen. xv. 16, "that the *fourth generation* (דּוֹר רְבִיעִי) shall return to Canaan," is to be understood, that the fourth descendants of those who immigrated into Egypt, would return to Palestine. Now Kohath was born to Levi in Canaan already, and nothing prevents us from supposing that he had at his arrival in Egypt already attained the manly age, and that he was considered like his elder brother Gershon, as the head of a family; so that his son may be counted as the first generation of Jacob's descendants who came to Egypt; now, if we take two generations between Kohath and Amram, which are not enumerated, and add thereto that of Moses, we have the four generations mentioned in Gen. xv. 16. But still more obvious is the conjecture to take דּוֹר, in that passage in the signification of *century*, like the Arabic دهر, from דּוּר (=דהר) to go round, to encircle (a *period*, *περίοδος*), and to translate: "*in the fourth century* they shall return to Canaan." Similarly explains Osburn:[1] "In the course of the fourth entire renewal of the living representatives of Abraham upon the earth, they shall return. The extreme limit of the expectation of life reaching at this time 120 years (Gen. vi. 3), it follows that the fourth generation actually was represented by Caleb and Joshua, when the Israelites returned to their land of promise." This supposition receives an almost incontrovertible confirmation from the statement in Numb. iii. 28, where the family of Kohath is said to have consisted, already in the time of Moses, of 8,600 souls; so that, if we divide this number between the four sons of Kohath (Amram, Izhar, Hebron, and

[1] Monumental History of Egypt, ii. p. 268.

Uzziel), the house of Amram, who had only two sons, would appear to have increased, in one generation, to 2,150 persons, which absurdity it is unnecessary to refute. And thus, it seems evident, that not all the heads of families, in the direct line from Levi to Moses, are mentioned in our text; for Kohath can (considering that passage in Numb.) by no means be the grandfather of Moses, to which fact we add, as another weighty evidence, that from Joseph to Joshua, the contemporary of Moses, ten generations are recorded, whilst from Levi to Moses only three are mentioned (vi. 16—27); and that the genealogy in the first Book of Chronicles (v. 29—36) enumerates fourteen generations from Aaron to Azariah, in the time of Ruth, to Solomon, during a period of 480 years, which gives about 35 years to each generation.[1]

3. We shall now give a brief account of the principal other computations of this period. The traditional Hebrew chronology of the epoch, from the emigration of Abraham from Chaldea, to the exit from Egypt, has already been stated and commented upon, and we have, in this instance, the strange phenomenon, that the most uncompromising orthodox advocates of the literal acceptation of the sacred text reject here the clear and unequivocal Biblical statement.

Zunz, in the chronological table annexed to his translation of the Bible, takes the interval from the immigration of Jacob into Egypt, to the Exodus, at 255 years (viz., from A.M. 2238 to 2493), whilst he puts down the period from the covenant between God and Abraham (see *supra*) to the Exodus, at 446 years (viz, from A.M. 2047 to 2493), and the time between Abraham's departure from Mesopotamia to the Exodus, at 470 years, none of which numbers are in accordance either with traditional chronology or with the computation explained above, and based upon the clear scriptural statements.

Jost[2] acknowledges the number 430 as the period of the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, but explains the difficulty in the genealogical table of Exod. vi. 14 *et seq.*, by the

[1] Compare also iv. 18—21. See *Perizonius*, Origg. Ægypt. i. p. 362; *Beer*, Ancient Chronology and History, i. p.166, *et seq.*; *Rosenm.*, Schol. I. ii. p. 226, 227; *Vater*, Pentat. ii. p. 41—44; *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. ii. p. 113; *De Wette*, Archæol. § 21; *Lengerke*, Kenaan, p. 367, *et seq.*

[2] Allgemeine Geschichte des Israelitischen Volkes i. p. 100.

following hypothesis: "The ancient genealogies describe chiefly the descent of *families*, not of *individuals*, although they sometimes combine both. . . . Now, the meaning of that genealogy would be, the family of Levi, as such, lasted 137 years; after the father's death it divided itself into three families, those of Gershon, Kohath, and Merari. The first branched out into two families, the second into four (after 133 years), and the third into two. From Amram's family, which had, at the time of the Exodus, existed 137 years, sprang Moses and Aaron. . . . These periods summed up (137+133+137) give 407 years." But Jost himself calls this conjecture *forced*, and it would indeed bring a most perplexing confusion into all Biblical lists, as we should be obliged to guess, in every individual case, whether a name is meant to designate one person, or to represent a family; and thus a subject sufficiently arduous and obscure in itself, would be encumbered with an additional difficulty more embarrassing than all the other intricacies, and not the less dangerous from the circumstance that it would open a new and endless arena to the mania of framing aerial conjectures.

Ewald,[1] who also considers 430 as the correct number, and even asserts that it is more and more confirmed at every new investigation, being one of the few safe foundations on which the whole chronology of Hebrew history is based, tries to remove the difficulty by the supposition (p. 514), that the years of the lives of Levi, Kohath and Amram, have been corrupted by tradition, and that they thence do not coincide with those 430 years. But this conjecture would only be efficient if we take their lives still *higher* than 137, 133 and 137 respectively; and Ewald, to whom these numbers already appear mythically exaggerated, would be the last to approve of that device.

Kitto,[2] who scrupulously adderes to the chronological researches of Dr. Hales and his summary corrections of Josephus, sets down the interval between the call of Abraham, and the Exodus, at 446 years (viz. A.M. 3318 to 3764), thus adopting, as nearly as possible the problematical alteration of the Samaritan and Septuagint versions, which we have shown to be erroneous. Into what difficulties this conjecture leads the author we shall soon have a striking instance to notice.

[1] Geschichte des Volkes Israel i. p. 505

[2] Hist. of Palest. p. 16.

We add, merely for the sake of completeness, the opinions of Bunsen:[1] "the sojourn of Israel in Egypt lasted 1440 years"; and of Lepsius:[2] "only about 90 years intervened from the entrance of Jacob to the Exodus of Moses." So greatly differ two of the most eminent Egyptologists in a point of no ordinary interest; and this circumstance cannot induce us to reject the clear statement of the sacred writer in favour of results derived from no more authentic sources than conjectural combinations and individual theories.

II. BIRTH OF MOSES.

The next chronological question of interest is, to ascertain which interval lies between the death of Joseph and the birth of Moses, or between Gen. l. 26, and Exod. ii. 2. After having endeavoured to establish the fact, that the whole sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt extended to 430 years, we have gained a safe basis for our further computations. Jacob was 130 years old when he came to Egypt (Gen. xlvii. 9, 28). He lived there 17 years, and died at the age of 147 years. Joseph survived him by about 54 years (Zunz; according to Hales, 52 years). Amram was, at the birth of Moses, married about 15 years (see note to ii. 8); and Moses was 80 years old at the time of the Exodus (vii. 7); we have, therefore, from the death of Joseph to the marriage of Amram 430 − (17 + 54 + 15 + 80) = 264 years; or to the birth of Moses 279 (264 + 15) years. And these numbers harmonize perfectly with all the circumstances connected with the Egyptian bondage and the Exodus of the Israelites. That period was extended enough to allow the descendants of Jacob to increase to a dangerously numerous people, although it could not eradicate or even weaken among them those independent and bold habits which constitute the most prominent characteristics of nomadic tribes, and which their new rulers, themselves children of the desert, considered it the first dictate of policy to check and to subdue, the more so, as a certain tradition of the authority enjoyed by their ancestors in Canaan lived clearly in their recollection, and stimulated them to regain that ancient influence. During that period, it is

[1] Egypt's Place, i. p. 171—178. [2] Einleitung, p. 316—338.

likewise probable, that the memory of the eminent services of Joseph had faded away in Egypt, and that the Israelites had begun to be regarded with an invidious and suspicious eye. Now Dr. Hales sets down the interval between the death of Joseph and the birth of Moses at 65 years. We shall scarcely be expected, after the preceding remarks, to attempt a demonstration of the impossibility of this supposition. The oppression of the Israelites commenced some time before the birth of Moses, because then the Israelites already had become so numerous as to cause apprehensions to the ruling dynasty. But can this enormous increase for a moment be considered possible within a space of time of about 60 years after the death of Joseph? The thoughtful reader will easily supply the other objections to that hypothesis, which is, however, only the necessary consequence of that author's erroneous and anti-Biblical computation of the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, viz.: $215 - (17 + 54 + 80) = 64$. That the holy writer hastens over that protracted period of 264 years with a very few passing words, will be found but natural, if the chief character and end of the Pentateuch is considered, which is, to give a historical account of the facts and circumstances explaining how Israel became a people, and how it became *the people of God*, worthy of His revelation and special providence. Everything, therefore, which has no reference to that end, is studiously omitted; the whole Pentateuch appears but a narration of the gradual fulfilment of the promises which God gave to Abraham. This can be substantiated by many instances, one of which will suffice, namely, the life of Moses previous to his appearing before Pharaoh, as the champion for Israel's deliverance. His education, and all his fates anterior to his first active interest for his brethren, and his flight to Midian, a period of at least 40 years (see note on ii. 11), are scarcely alluded to; the transition from his birth and childhood to that event, is merely introduced with the words: "And Moses grew, and he went out to see his brethren." And so the interval between his flight to Midian and his return to Egypt, an epoch of about the same duration, is passed over with silence, because a detailed history of those times would have thrown no light upon the progress of Israel as the chosen people. Both the bondage of the Hebrews in

Egypt, the education and sojourn of Moses in Midian were times of preparation, the one for forming a people out of a family, the other for maturing the character and intellect of the chosen instrument of their mental and political elevation; but, as times of preparation, they required no specified description; and in this respect the historiography of the Bible is truly pragmatical and teleological, composed throughout with strict regard to means and ends, causes and effects. And from the same motive, no doubt, many facts, even such as would have added to the glory of Israel, have been omitted by the sacred writer, because they would have distracted the attention from the aim of the narrative. And in this sense we accede to Ewald's remarks[1]: "If we look at external success and worldly splendour, the effects of the deeds of Moses in Egypt were undoubtedly still greater than we can conclude from the narratives of the Old Testament, which everywhere moves so much in the sphere of spirituality, that the worldly affairs and interests almost disappear before it." But other reasons co-operated to cause that long period of 264 years to be but summarily adverted to. It is an acknowledged truism, that slaves have no history; for history consists in the development of individual faculties or political institutions; but without liberty there can be no progress. Thus the bondage offered no subject or materials for the historian, and although we have strong reasons to believe that the Hebrews remained during a very considerable portion of that period unmolested by the rulers and the people of Egypt, and that they continued undisturbed their nomadic and agricultural pursuits (see note to i. 11), yet this uniformity and even monotony of their occupations, removed from the scenes of political warfare or social strife, excluded them from the annals of history. We can, on the whole, only describe the manners and customs, not write the history, of the Arabian Bedouins, although they are one of the most ancient tribes of the world. But, however *briefly* our text alludes to that long period, it does not treat it *defectively;* we find no feature wanting to represent to ourselves a complete picture of that interval; a simple subject requires but a few bold lines, and the division of the two Books (Genesis and Exodus), which is

[1] Loc. cit. ii. p. 63.

markedly indicated by the repetition of Jacob's genealogy, carries the reader over the gap of centuries.

III. THE EXODUS FROM EGYPT FIXED AFTER YEARS OF THE WORLD AND OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA.

We have hitherto only endeavoured to determine the principal events of our Book according to the absolute statements of the Bible, irrespective of the chronology of universal history, which is, however, indispensable for a clear understanding of that important period of Biblical history; for we can only comprehend and appreciate the significance of a historical fact by considering it in connection and relation with the other important synchronical events. Two points are chiefly to be examined:—1. In what year of the world, and before the vulgar era, the Exodus of the Israelites took place; and, 2. Under which Egyptian king that event happened.

1. As to the first question, we do not hesitate to adopt the usual Hebrew account, according to which the first year of the Christian era is the 3760th year of the world (repudiating that of Josephus, who gives a much larger number). Now we learn from 1 Kings vi. 1, that Solomon began the building of the temple in the fourth year of his reign, or 480 years after the Exodus; and as, according to modern chronological researches, Solomon reigned from 1015 to 975 B.C., it follows:—(*a*) that the Exodus took place in 1491 B.C. (viz. 1011 + 480); or, (*b*) in 2269 A.M. (viz. 3760 − 1491), i.e. about the time of the immigration of Danaus and Cadmus into Greece, with which, indeed, Diodorus of Sicily, brings the Exodus of the Israelites into connection.[1] Now we can easily, with the aid of the results established in the preceding remarks, fix the chronology of the chief events narrated in our book, namely:—

1. Jacob and his family immigrated into Egypt 1839 A.M. (viz. 2269 − 430) or 1921 B.C. (viz. 1491 + 430).
2. Jacob died 1856 A.M. (viz. 1839 + 17) or 1904 B.C. (viz. 1921 − 17).
3. Joseph died 1910 A.M. (viz. 1856 + 54) or 1850 B.C. (viz. 1904 − 54).
4. Moses was born 2189 A.M. (viz. 2269 − 80) or 1571 B.C. (viz. 1491 + 80).

[1] See infra, § 3, vi.

5. The Exodus took place 2269 A.M., or 1491 B.C.[1]

6. The Book of Exodus contains the history of 360 years, viz. from 1910 to 2270 A.M. or from 1850 to 1490 B.C.—The number 145 usually stated for this period is therefore erroneous.

We presume, that these computations will be found sufficient for our purpose; and we shall not be expected to enter here into the much vexed question concerning the shorter (Hebrew), and longer (Greek) chronologies, or the relation between the years of the world and those of the Christian era. The single fact, that the creation of the world is by some fixed at 3760 years before Christ (vulgar Hebrew account), whilst others put it down at 5508 B.C. (Dr. Hales, after Josephus), thus fluctuating within an interval of not less than 1748 years, this one fact will suffice to show the extreme uncertainty respecting this subject. We may, however, add, that the Hebrew computation, which is based on the Biblical statements, deserves the preference before the questionable alterations of the Septuagint and Josephus, and those who follow them.[2]

2. The second question, "under which king the Israelites left the Egyptian dominions," is, if possible, enveloped in still denser clouds; and it would be fruitless to fatigue the reader by leading him through the labyrinth of conflicting traditions and statements, of contradictory names and irreconcilable numbers; for there are scarcely two coinciding reports on the same subject in the vast and dry accounts of the Egyptian dynasties, and, after all the time and exertion spent on the investigation of this subject, we arrive, at the best, only at a sterile and unprofitable nomenclature, which increases very little the extent of our Biblical knowledge. We refrain, therefore, from repeating here our examination of the various and very diverging conjectures proposed with regard to that monarch; and think it the most advisable course to follow that account, which, by its antiquity and internal probability, has at present the greatest relative claims to our consideration.

[1] See supra.

[2] The Exodus took place, according to *Seyffart*, 1867 B.C.; *Hoffman*, 3996 A.M.; *Hales*, 1648 B.C., or 3764 A.M.; *Munk*, 1600 B.C.; *Jackson*, 1593 B.C.; *Playfair*, 1555 B.C.; *Petavius*, 1531 B.C.; *Scaliger*, 1497 B.C. *Usher* and others, 1491 B.C.; *Helvicus* and *Marsham*, 1488 B.C.; *Lepsius* and others, 1314 B.C.

Josephus states,[1] on the authority of Manetho, that the Israelites left Egypt during the reign of the King Ramses V., Amenophis,[2] who was the last of the sixteen monarchs of the eighteenth (Diospolitanic) dynasty, and whose misfortune at the Red Sea might have caused the fall of his house. This statement agrees with other chronological dates connected therewith. For the three dynasties succeeding that which ended with Amenophis, viz. the nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first, reigned, according to Julius Africanus, together, during 474, or, according to Eusebius, during 496 years. Further, Shishak (1 Kings xiv. 25), i.e. Sesonchis, the founder of the twenty-second dynasty, or that of the Bubastides, who reigned 21 years, ascended the Egyptian throne in the last part of Solomon's reign, who built the temple in the fourth year after his accession, or 480 years after the Exodus.[3] Therefore, even according to the larger of the two numbers above cited (496), the Exodus may fall into the time of Amenophis, who reigned 30 years, according to Josephus (ch. 15), and 40 years, according to Eusebius. Champollion also arrived, by the study and combination of the ancient inscriptions, at the same result: "La captivité dura autant que la XVIIIe dynastie, et ce fut sous Ramsès V. ou Aménophis, au commencement du XVe siècle, que Moyse délivra les Hebreux."[4] Authentic and

[1] Contr. Ap. i. 26. [2] Compare Chaeremon, ibid. i. 32.

[3] See *supra*, p. xx.

[4] There are other opinions: Artapanus, Eusebius and Syncellus believe, that the Exodus took place under Anchencheres or Chencheres, the ninth king of the eighteenth Diospolitanic dynasty, in the sixteenth or last year of his reign (*Euseb.*, Chron. Arm. i. p. 215); according to Lysimachus, under king Bocchoris (*Joseph.*, Ap. i. 34; compare *Tacit.*, Hist. v. 3), which is indubitably erroneous, as Bocchoris is, after the statement of Eusebius, a contemporary of Pekah, king of Israel (see *infra*, p. xxvii.); according to Ptolemaeus Mendesius, Theophilus of Antiochia, Clemens of Alexandria, Julian and Tertullian, under king Amosis; according to Polemo, under Apis, son of Phoronnus (*Euseb.*, Praep. Evan. x.10); according to Archimander, under Menephtha II., the successor of Sesostris. Compare *Hoffman*, "Unter welcher Dynastie haben die Israeliten Aegypten verlassen?" *Rosellini*, Monumm. Storici, i. 291—300 (who mentions Ramses III., surnamed Maiamum, an earlier king of the eighteenth dynasty); *Bois Aymé*, in the Déscription de l'Egypte, viii. p.104 *et seq.*; *Ewald*, Isr. Gesch. i. p. 515 *et seq.*, ii. 66, 67; *Lengerke*, Kenaan, i. 364 *et seq* ; *De Wette*, Arch. § 23; *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. ii. p.117; *Wilkinson*, Egypt and Thebes, p. 506, 507, and Ancient Egyptians, i. 76 (who places the arrival of Joseph in the reign of Osirtasen I., the birth of Moses in that of Amosis, "the new

valuable information on this and many other important archæological points may reasonably be expected from the study of the ancient sculptured monuments, which have already yielded many useful and interesting results pregnant of greater promise.

We conclude by summing up the results of our remarks:

1. The sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt lasted 430 years.

2. From the death of Joseph to the birth of Moses elapsed a period of 279 years.

3. The Exodus took place 2269 A. M. or 1491 B.C.; and

4. Under Ramses V., Amenophis, the last king of the eighteenth dynasty.

§ 3. ACCOUNTS OF ANCIENT PROFANE WRITERS ON THE EXODUS.

The fates of the Israelites, connected as they were with the history of several important nations of antiquity, were too remarkable from the commencement, not to attract and arrest the attention of the ancient historians. It is true, few, if any, of the old writers were able to perceive in the *internal* life of the Israelites, and in the purity of their new doctrines, the incalculable influence which they exercised upon the course and development of universal history; but even the extraordinary *external* character of the destinies of the house of Jacob, which from a few ancestors, branched out into a numerous nation, powerful enough to extirpate or to subjugate the mighty tribes of Canaan; even these events, considered as a mere episode of history, were necessarily calculated to excite the interest of reflecting minds, and to attract even the curiosity of the more superficial observer. And thus we possess a variety of accounts furnished by ancient historians concerning the sojourn of the Israelites in, and their departure from, Egypt. But these narratives are mostly of a very singular nature. It is the privilege of individuals with

king," i. 8; and the Exodus in that of Thotmes III.); *Lord Prudhoe*, in Wilkinson's Manners i. 77 *et seq.* (who dates the Exodus under Pthamenoph, about 200 years earlier than the dates established by Wilkinson); *Kitto*, Hist. of Palestine, i. 184 *et seq.* (who strives, by bold conjectures, to combine the results of Dr. Hales' and Wilkinson's researches); *Osburn*, Monumental History, ii. p. 553—606 (under Sethos II.).

carefully cultivated and trained intellects, to penetrate with an unbiassed and unprejudiced eye into the circumstances and habits of others, however differing from their own, to estimate their importance and character, and to form an accurate and calm judgment. This power of abstraction, or *objectivity*, was withheld from most of the ancient writers; they generally judge other polities after the notions prevalent in their own respective countries, condemning everything which is at variance with their ideas or institutions; and whilst they thus, on the whole, furnish authentic and accurate information concerning their own lands, their reports about foreign nations are generally disfigured by erroneous and one-sided conceptions, and too often distorted by prejudice, national antipathy, and religious animosity. This is, in general, also the character of the profane accounts of the Exodus of the Israelites; but they are, nevertheless, both interesting and important, for it is certain that none of them is in any way derived from the Bible[1]; they are original information, taken from different other sources, especially, no doubt, from Egyptian records; and although they represent the events in a fanciful and exaggerated manner, they certainly corroborate the narrative of the Bible in every essential particular, which agreement must give additional authority to the sacred records, even in the eyes of those who are accustomed to value their religious importance higher than their historical accuracy.

We shall introduce those profane accounts, mostly in literal translations, or, if they are too lengthened, in abridgments, and shall only, when necessary, add a few remarks on their character and trustworthiness, as the reader will himself easily observe the deviations from the sacred narrative.

I.—MANETHO (usually believed to have lived as the chief of the priests of Heliopolis, about 280 B. C., in the reigns of Ptolemy Lagi and Philadelphus[2]) relates:[3] "The Egyptian

[1] See *Josephus*, contra Apion., i. 23.

[2] See, however, *Hengstenberg*, Die Bücher Moses' und Aegypten (p. 237—245, 256), who endeavours to prove, with good arguments, that this Manetho, from whose writings Josephus, Plutarch, Julius Africanus, Eusebius, and other ancient authors give extracts, never resided in Egypt, and that he did not live earlier than about the beginning of the vulgar era.

[3] *Joseph.*, contra Apion., i. 26, 27.

king, Amenophis, wished, on the advice of an oracle, to purify the country of 80,000 leprous Jews, and sent them into the quarries on the east side of the Nile,[1] but later, he assigned to them, as their abodes, the town Avaris,[2] which had been quitted by the Hyksos, and which was consecrated to Typhon. There they chose Osarsiph, a priest of Osiris, from Hieropolis, who was later called Moses,[3] as their leader; he gave them new and strict laws, commanded them to abandon idolatry, to kill and eat all animals held sacred among the Egyptians, and to associate with nobody except their own brethren, in order thus to estrange them from Egyptian customs. Osarsiph then fortified the town of Avaris, and made all military preparations for an attack against the Egyptians; he further sent ambassadors to the Hyksos, who had been expelled by the preceding king, Thummoris, and were then living in Jerusalem. The Hyksos, tempted by the promise, that Avaris, which had formerly been in their possession, should be restored to them, came to their aid with 200,000 men. Amenophis, although he was at the head of 300,000 men, did not dare to accept battle, but retreated to Memphis, and went then, with many ships, and a great army, to Ethiopia, where he found a hospitable reception from the king, his friend. The Hyksos [whom Manetho calls Solymites] made, in the mean time, great devastations in Egypt, burnt towns and villages, destroyed the images of the gods, and killed the holy animals of the Egyptians; but when Amenophis returned, after thirteen years, he defeated both the Hyksos and the Jews, and pursued them to the boundaries of Syria." We observe, on this account: 1. The fable about the leprosy of the Israelites, which, it is asserted, made them especially hateful in the eyes of the Egyptians, and which myth has been repeated even by modern writers, may perhaps be reduced to the miracle of the leprous hand of Moses, narrated in Exod. iv. 6, 7, and the sixth plague, that of boils (שְׁחִין, Exod. ix. 8—12), with which it was erroneously supposed the Israelites were infested, who spread the disease, by contagion, among the Egyptians. It is, on the contrary, evident, from Deut. xxviii. 27, that the Egyptians are chiefly subject to that

[1] Compare Exod. i. 11, 14; v. 6 *et seq.*
[2] See note on i. 11, *sub* Raamses.
[3] See note on ii. 10.

epidemic, a fact which is confirmed by many other accounts.[1] Moreover, the tenor of Manetho's story itself shows, that not the leprosy of the Israelites, but their dangerous position, induced the Egyptians to hostile measures. But this does not prevent us from admitting, that the Israelites also were not quite free from that disorder so common in Egypt, especially if we consider their oppressed social condition; which fact is besides corroborated by the minute precepts of the Mosaic law respecting the treatment of that disease.[2] 2. The statement, that Moses (Osarsiph) was a priest of Osiris, is a fiction, although it has been repeatedly advanced.[3] 3. That the Hyksos, after having once been expelled from Egypt, had been called back by the Israelites to assist them against the Egyptians, is improbable in itself, and is at variance with other historical facts.[4] 4. The Hyksos (Solymites) cannot be imagined to have dwelt in Jerusalem so early as the time of the Exodus. 5. The Egyptian king may have pursued the Israelites northwards; but it is incredible that he should have followed them to the frontier of Syria; unless we understand thereby either the mere direction thither, or take Syria in its later sense, as comprising Palestine also. But, notwithstanding all this, the following facts are evident from that account:—1. The Israelites were compelled by the Egyptian king to hard labour, and were treated and persecuted as enemies. 2. Moses led them from Egypt. 3. Their Exodus was connected with a temporary ruin of the Egyptian power. 4. Moses gave to the Israelites laws, enjoining monotheism as the fundamental principle, and severely interdicting idolatry, and every connection with pagan nations. 5. The war between Pharaoh and the Israelites was partly a religious one, for, according to the Biblical narrative also, the doctrine of monotheism unfolded itself in the Hebrew nation, on the Egyptian soil, and in opposition to Egyptian animal-worship (see viii. 22).

II.—Chaeremon (in the first half of the first century of the vulgar era; lived long in Alexandria, where he was chief librarian, and occupied himself much with Egyptian

[1] See note on ix. 8. [2] See Déscript. de l'Egypt., xiii. p. 159 *et seq.*

[3] Even Ewald calls it possibly a genuine historical reminiscence; see our note on ii. 10. [4] See note on i. 8.

antiquities), narrates, in his History of Egypt:[1] "Amenophis, exhorted by apparitions of the goddess of Isis, expelled 250,000 lepers, under their leaders Moses and Joseph, whose original Egyptian names were Tisithen and Peteseph. When they arrived at Pelusium they met a great number of people (380,000 men), whom Amenophis had refused to admit into Egypt. They joined them, marched back to Egypt, and caused Amenophis to flee to Ethiopia. But his wife, whom he had left in Egypt, bare, shortly afterwards, a son, who, when arrived at maturity, drove the Israelites to Syria, whereupon his father returned from Ethiopia." Without essentially deviating from the chief facts narrated by Manetho, this account of Chaeremon adds some new inaccuracies to those of his predecessor:—1. Joseph and Moses are represented as contemporaries; 2. the number of the Hyksos rises from 280,000 to 380,000.

III.—Lysimachus (of Alexandria, later than Chaeremon, author of the *Νοστοί*, and *Συναγωγὴ Θηβαϊκῶν παραδόξων*),[2] relates:[3] "A great famine having befallen Egypt, king Bocchoris was commanded, by an oracle of Ammon, to drown the leprous Israelites, and to send the rest into the desert. The latter, after a night of fasting and consultation, were advised by Moses to proceed, and to overthrow all temples and altars on their way. They followed his council, arrived after many tribulations in Judea, built here a town, Hierosyla (so denominated from their plundering the temples), but changed its name later into Hierosolyma." We observe:—1. The drowning of the Israelites is probably nothing but the exposing of the Hebrew children in the Nile. 2. The night of fasting and consultation refers most likely to the evening before the Exodus (ליל שמורים, xii. 32), and the rites of the Paschal-lamb; and 3. The destroying of the altars to commands, as those in xxiii. 24, etc. 4. The account about the name and the foundation of Jerusalem is entirely fabulous. 5. The Egyptian king, under whom the Israelites left the country, is here called Bocchoris, who is also mentioned by Diodorus (i. 45, 79); Tacitus (Hist. v. 3); Aelian (Hist. An. xi. 11); Plutarch (De Isid. § 8); and others. According to

[1] *Joseph.*, contra Apion., i. 32, 33.
[2] See *Montfaucon*, Collectio Nova Patrum et Scripp. Gr., ii. 341.
[3] *Joseph.*, contra Apion., i. 34, 35.

Diodorus, he lived about 900 B. C.; according to Manetho he belonged to the twenty-fourth dynasty; and Wilkinson (Ancient Egyptians i. pp. 130, 138) dates the commencement of his reign at B. C. 812. This period is considerably too late for the Exodus, and was probably only adopted in an age in which the tendency prevailed to question the antiquity of the Hebrew nation.[1] Ewald judges thus, evidently with too great severity, on the account of Lysimachus: "Here we have an instance of heedless historiography, and blind hatred against the Jews, such as we can scarcely imagine in a higher degree; we see what monstrous combinations may, under the thoughtless pen of some Greek writers, result from the mixture of Egyptian and Hebrew sources."

IV.—ARTAPANUS (author of a history of the Jews, *Περὶ Ἰουδαίων*) writes on the transit over the Red Sea:—"The Memphites relate, that Moses, being well acquainted with the country, watched the influx of the tide, and made the multitude pass through the dry bed of the sea. But the Heliopolitans relate, that the king, at the head of a great army, and accompanied by the sacred animals, pursued after the Jews, who had carried off with them the wealth of the Egyptians; and Moses, having been directed by a Divine vision to strike the sea with his staff, touched the water with it, and so the fluid divided itself, and the hosts passed over the gulf as on a dry path. But when the Egyptians tried the same, and pursued them in the bed of the sea, it is said that fire flashed against them in front, and the sea, returning to its old place, overwhelmed them in the passage. Thus the Egyptians perished both by fire and by the reflux of the tide."[2]

V.—STRABO (between about 66 B.C. and 25 A.C.) gives the following account:[3]—"The most generally received opinion is, that the Israelites are descendants of the Egyptians; a certain Moses, a priest, dissatisfied with the state of things in Egypt, emigrated, accompanied by many who worshipped the Deity." That the Hebrews are represented as descendants of the Egyptians, may originate in the

[1] *Lengerke*, Kenaan, p.416; compare J. G. Müller, Stud. u. Krit., 1843, p.916—921.

[2] *Euseb.*, Praep. Evang., ix. 27; compare *Clem. Alex.*, Strom. i. p.149; *Hengstenberg*, *loc. cit.* p.275; see notes on xiv. 21, 22.

[3] xvi. 760—762.

circumstance, that the family of Joseph, who married the daughter of an Egyptian priest (Gen. xli. 45), could in some respects be considered as Egyptian. According to Strabo, the Hebrews left Egypt with their free will, whilst the other profane historians describe the Exodus generally as an expulsion.

VI.—Diodorus (of Sicily, in the time of Caesar and Augustus) relates,[1] that "Antiochus Epiphanes, after having taken Jerusalem, was most urgently entreated, by many of his friends, to destroy that town, and to devastate the whole country. For the Jews, they said, were a people which alone of all other nations, repudiates every alliance or friendship with others; their forefathers had been expelled from Egypt as impious men, and as creatures hateful to the gods, especially on account of their leprosy, and had then settled in the vicinity of Jerusalem." But in another passage (xl. i.) he writes, that "a pestilence once broke out in Egypt, in consequence of the many foreigners who refused to revere the native gods; these strangers were therefore expelled; the more distinguished and vigorous of them emigrated, under the leadership of Danaus and Cadmus, to Greece, whilst the rest marched, under Moses, to Judea, which was at that time quite desolate, but where Moses built Jerusalem and the temple, and organized the state by peculiar laws." The chronology is here stated with correctness, but, in all other respects, these two accounts of Diodorus share the mistakes of both Manetho and Chaeremon; and the invidiousness with which the Israelites are mentioned must be attributed to the spirit of intolerance peculiar to that time, and to the hostile disposition of Antiochus Epiphanes, who vied with Pharaoh in cruelty against the Jews and surpassed him.

VII.—Apion (about 40 A.C., who follows Lysimachus) says:[2]—"That Moses, of Heliopolis, led leprous, lame and blind Jews out of Egypt, in the first year of the seventh Olympiad, in which he asserts, the Phoenicians built Carthage, and arrived, after a journey of six days, safely in Judea." Josephus, who severely criticises and ridicules this fabulous statement of Apion, remarks, concerning the chronology, that Hiram, the contemporary of Solomon, lived above 150 years earlier than the building of Carthage.

[1] xxxiv. 1. [2] *Joseph.*, Contra Apion. ii. 2.

VIII.—The most remarkable is the account given by TACITUS, perhaps the most eminent historian of antiquity, whose sagacity, impartiality, and calm estimation of the circumstances and events, generally entitle him to be considered as a most competent authority, but who advances, with regard to the Israelites, nearly the same confused fables which Lysimachus offers, although it must have been very easy for him, considering the time in which he lived (60—117 A.C.) to obtain the most authentic information concerning that remarkable nation. He first enumerates (Hist. v. 2) the different ancient opinions concerning the origin of the Jews, who are described either as *Cretans*, (Ideans, from mount Ida), or as *Egyptians*, (who had immigrated in the time of Isis, and escaped under the leadership of Hierosolymus and Judea), or as *Ethiopians* (who left their land in the reign of Cepheus), or as *Assyrians* (a wandering tribe, which once took possession of a part of Egypt, but soon found undisputed abodes in Palestine), or as the *Solymi*, mentioned in Homer, who called the city which they built Hierosolyma, from their own name. Then he continues, about the Exodus (v. 3): "Very many historians agree, that a hideous pestilence having broken out in Egypt, king Bocchoris, eager to obtain a remedy, consulted the oracle of Hammon, which commanded him to purify the land by expelling into other countries that people (the Israelites) which was hateful to the gods. They were, therefore, gathered from all parts, and being driven into a dreary desert, and breaking out into despair and lamentations, Moses alone, of all the exiles, exhorted them not to expect any assistance, either from the gods or from men, as they had been deserted by both, but only to trust themselves to him as a celestial leader by whose aid they had already conquered their present miseries. They assented, and commenced, in perfect ignorance, their planless march." The affinity of this narration of Tacitus with the account of Lysimachus will be easily perceived, and as to his conjecture concerning the descent of the Israelites from Crete, Egypt, Ethiopia, or Assyria, this contradictory uncertainty alone is sufficient to make it highly questionable, although the fourth account representing the Hebrews successively as Assyrian emigrants, sojourners in Egypt, and conquerors of Pales-

tine, agrees essentially with the Biblical narration.[1] But these notices are to us an interesting and warning instance with what careful consideration the remarks of ancient writers concerning the origin and history of foreign nations are to be read and used.

IX. JUSTINUS (in the beginning of the fifth century, A.C., whose work is an abridgment of the Universal History of Trogus Pompejus, who flourished in the time of Augustus) relates:[2] "The Jews are descended from Damascus, king of Syria, among whose successors were Abraham and Israhel [Israel]. The latter had ten sons, among whom he distributed the empire, which he ordered to be henceforth called Judea, from Juda, who had died immediately after the division. His youngest son was Joseph, whom the brothers, apprehending his superior genius, sold into Egypt, where he soon by his wisdom, and especially his skill in interpreting dreams, rose high in the king's favour, and by his agricultural arrangement saved the land during a protracted period of sterility. His son was Moses, who was not only distinguished by erudition, but also by striking beauty.[3] But when the Egyptians suffered from leprosy and tetters, they expelled him with the infected persons from the territories of Egypt, lest the disease should spread still further. He took furtively the sacred implements of the Egyptians with him;[4] the latter, to recover them, pursued the Jews with an army, but were compelled by a tempest[5] to return. [Then follows the strange explanation of the Sabbath as a fast-day, see notes on xx. 8—11, p. 362, and of the laws interdicting communication with heathens; and he concludes]: After Moses, his son Aruas [Aaron], who had been priest in Egyptian temples, succeeded as king; and since then it became customary among the Jews, that their kings performed at the same time sacerdotal functions." We remark: 1. The origin of the Israelites from Syria coincides with one account of Tacitus, since Justinus also adds: "unde (e Syria) et Assyriis regibus genus, ex regina Semirami, fuit." 2. That Abraham and Israel were reported as

[1] See, about these statements of Tacitus, the criticisms of J. G. Müller, p. 893 *et seq.*; compare also the first book of Josephus' work against Apion.

[2] xxxvi. 2.

[3] See ii. 2; comp. *Joseph.*, Antiq. II. ix. 6; Acts vii. 20.

[4] See note on iii. 21, 22.

[5] xiv. 21.

kings of Syria, may have been occasioned by the fame of their great wealth (Gen. xii. 5; xiii. 2, 5; xiv., etc.; compare xiv. 15, and xv. 2). 3. The *ten* tribes and the name *Judea* are confused notions from the later times of the divided empire. 4. Joseph and Moses are, as in the account of Chaeremon (see ii.), brought into a close chronological connection. 5. The statement, that the kings of Israel performed at the same time pontifical functions is not correct, and may be the result of a misconception of the *theocratical* institutions of Israel.[1] 6. The author reports nothing about the fate of the other nine sons of Israel and their descendants, and about their connection with the returning progeny of Joseph.—The other inaccuracies in Justinus' account are too obvious to require comment.

We abstain from giving an extract from the History of the Jews attributed to Hecataeus of Abdera, who was a contemporary of Alexander the Great (Joseph.c. Ap.i. 22), since even Origen declared that work spurious (C. Cels. i. 15).

All these accounts combined, however scanty and contradictory they are, have yet that incalculable importance, that they confirm and raise beyond the shadow of a doubt, the great and momentous events which form the chief interest of our book, and that they, on the other hand, just by their confusedness, show the lucidity and authenticity of the Biblical relation in a clearer and more advantageous light.

[1] See note on xix. 6; compare, however, also note on ii. 16.

שְׁמוֹת

EXODUS.

וָאֶשָּׂא אֶתְכֶם עַל־כַּנְפֵי נְשָׁרִים וָאָבִא אֶתְכֶם אֵלָי׃

"And I bore you on eagles' wings, and brought you to myself."—xix. 4.

שׁ מ ו ת

וְאֵ֗לֶּה שְׁמוֹת֙ בְּנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל הַבָּאִ֖ים מִצְרָ֑יְמָה אֵ֣ת יַעֲקֹ֔ב אִ֥ישׁ וּבֵית֖וֹ
בָּֽאוּ׃ 2 רְאוּבֵ֣ן שִׁמְע֔וֹן לֵוִ֖י וִיהוּדָֽה׃ 3 יִשָּׂשכָ֥ר זְבוּלֻ֖ן
וּבִנְיָמִֽן׃ 4 דָּ֥ן וְנַפְתָּלִ֖י גָּ֥ד וְאָשֵֽׁר׃ 5 וַיְהִ֗י כָּל־נֶ֛פֶשׁ יֹצְאֵ֥י יֶֽרֶךְ־יַעֲקֹ֖ב
שִׁבְעִ֣ים נָ֑פֶשׁ וְיוֹסֵ֖ף הָיָ֥ה בְמִצְרָֽיִם׃ 6 וַיָּ֤מָת יוֹסֵף֙ וְכָל־אֶחָ֔יו וְכֹ֖ל

CHAPTER I.

Summary.—The seventy individuals, who had immigrated into Egypt in the time of Jacob, increased, in the course of some centuries, to such a numerous people, that a later Pharaoh from another dynasty, ignorant or unmindful of the important services Joseph had rendered to the Egyptian monarchy, and fearful lest the Hebrews join his political-internal-enemies, and leave the land, to his great disadvantage, devised various despotic plans for their diminution: first he tried to exhaust their energies by severe and excessive labour; then he ordered the midwives to kill all male children; and, lastly, he charged all his subjects to watch that every new-born boy be thrown into the Nile.

1. The events related in the first chapter, from the death of Joseph (Gen. l. 26) to the marriage of Amram and Jochebed, comprise a period of 264 years (see *Introduction*, § 2. II), viz. from 1910 A.M. to 2174 A.M. (or 1850 B.C. to 1586 B.C.), (see *Introduction*, § 2. III). As the history of the descendants of Jacob in Egypt is about to be related, the sons of that patriarch are again enumerated, a complete list of all the members of his family at the time of their immigration into Egypt having already been given in Genesis xlvi. 8–27. That genealogy is further repeated here, in order to indicate, in the most striking manner possible, the commencement of the new epoch in the history of the progeny of Abraham.—(ואלה) *Now these.* Ebn Ezra connects the conjunction (ו) with Genesis l. 23, where the progeny of Joseph is alluded to; Salomon ("The Pentateuch Translated and Explained") with the promises contained in Gen. l. 24, 25. It indicates certainly the close connection between the two first books; as, in fact, the whole Pentateuch is intended as one continuous narrative.—הבאים *who came.* The participle *kal* is here equivalent to אשר באו, or the relative and the *past* tense; see Gesen. Gram. § 131. 2. c. מצרימה *into Egypt.* About the ה paragogicum locale, denoting the direction *to* a place, see Gesen. Gram. § 93. 1. a.—*Every man came with his household.* In the word ביתו the wives of Jacob's sons and grandsons are not counted, for as Ebn Ezra remarks: "an individual *with* his wife, that only is the man." The English version, scrupulously faithful to the tonic accents of the masoretic text, takes the words *with Jacob* to the second part of the sentence, thereby impairing the simplicity of the sense. None of the ancient versions offers a similar rendering.

2—4. Rashbam, in order to justify the partial repetition from Gen. xlvi. 8—27, thus explains the connection of these verses: "The descendants of Israel multiplied

EXODUS.

CHAP. I. 1. Now these are the names of the children of Israel, who came into Egypt with Jacob; [1]*every* man came with his house*hold*. 2. Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah, 3. Issachar, Zebulun, and Benjamin, 4. Dan, and Naphtali, Gad, and Asher. 5. And all the souls that came out of the loins of Jacob were seventy souls: and Joseph was in Egypt *already*. 6. And Joseph died, and

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Every man and his household came with Jacob.

prodigiously, *although* they were originally but 70 in number." Thus also Cahen. The order, in which the sons of Jacob are enumerated, is: first the children of his wives Leah and Rachel, then those of their maid-servants Bilhah and Zilpah, and lastly Joseph, because he did not emigrate together with the other members of his family.

5. *That came out of the loins of Jacob;* a frequent scriptural metaphor for *begotten* by Jacob, or, his children, see Gen. xlvi. 26. ויוסף היה במצרים the sense is: and of these (seventy souls), Joseph (and his sons) lived then in Egypt. Mendelssohn translates therefore aptly, though freely, *siebzig Personen mit Joseph, der in Mizraim war.* About the number seventy, see Raphall's elaborate note to Gen. xlvi. 26, and note C. of the Appendix, where the opinion of Ebn Ezra, that the seventieth person (for the text enumerates only sixty-nine) is Jacob himself, although it might, at the first glance, appear, that he cannot appropriately be included among *those that came out of the loins of Jacob*, is convincingly defended against the tradition, according to which the number of seventy souls is completed by Jochebed (the mother of Moses), who is asserted to have been born precisely at the time of their entering Egypt, but who, if this opinion were correct, would, even according to traditionary chronology, have been 135 years old when she gave birth to Moses (see note to ii. 1). The Septuagint has seventy-five instead of seventy, as in Gen. xlvi. 27, where it arbitrarily adds five of the descendants of Ephraim and Manasseh enumerated in 1 Chron. vii. 14—19. Besides this, the Septuagint exhibits in this verse another deviation from the usual text, viz., it *begins* the verse with the words Ἰωσὴφ δὲ ἦν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ *and Joseph was in Egypt*.

6. *And Joseph died*, etc. This verse clearly resumes the thread of the narration from the point to which it had been carried on in the preceding book (l. 26), and repeats, therefore, briefly, the event there stated: "So then Joseph died," etc. —*And all that generation*, comprising a rather protracted period of an indefinite number of years; for Levi survived Joseph by about twenty-five years, compare Gen. l. 26, and Exod. vi. 16.

7. במאד מאד properly with force of force, *i. e.* most forcibly, in an extraordinary degree (מאד being originally a substantive, strength, force, Deut. vi. 5, from the root אוד to be strong, as in Arab. آل instead of أيد; and أيد and آد signify strength, like מאד. See *Gesenius*, The-

הַדּ֥וֹר הַהֽוּא׃ 7 וּבְנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵ֗ל פָּר֧וּ וַֽיִּשְׁרְצ֛וּ וַיִּרְבּ֥וּ וַיַּֽעַצְמ֖וּ בִּמְאֹ֣ד
מְאֹ֑ד וַתִּמָּלֵ֥א הָאָ֖רֶץ אֹתָֽם׃ פ
8 וַיָּ֥קָם מֶֽלֶךְ־חָדָ֖שׁ עַל־מִצְרָ֑יִם אֲשֶׁ֥ר לֹֽא־יָדַ֖ע אֶת־יוֹסֵֽף׃ 9 וַיֹּ֖אמֶר

saurus, i. page 35). Ebn Ezra explains the prefix ב in במאד after the analogy of ויסעו בראשנה (Numb. x. 13), disregarding the etymology of מאד.—ותמלא הארץ אתם *and the land was filled with them.* If the verbs which govern a double accusative, one of the person, and one of the thing (for instance למד, שאל, מלא, לבש) are used in the passive or reflective form, the first accusative naturally changes into a nominative, *but the second remains*, and therefore we have in our passage אתם *of them* (compare 2 Sam. vi. 2; 1 Kings vi. 7; xxii. 10; Hab. ii. 19; 2 Sam. vi. 14; xv. 32; קרוע כתנתו *Sept.* *διεῤῥαγὼς τὸν χιτῶνα*, *Engl. Vers.* with his coat rent. See *Ewald*, Heb. Gram., § 533). The Septuagint translates *ἐπλήθυνε δὲ ἡ γῆ αὐτούς*.—The accumulation of the Synonyms (פרו וישרצו וכו'), peculiar to oriental idioms, is simply intended to express the utmost fruitfulness and increase; and we need, therefore, not to adopt the distinctions which ancient commentators find in them (see Rashi, Ramban, Ebn Ezra, Abarbanel), although we easily concur in the opinion, that the verbs here used denote different *modifications* of the same notion (פרה is applied to general fertility in the whole organic nature; שרץ properly only used of animals, such as reptiles, insects, etc., see Gesenius) and that the Hebrew women gave birth to more than one child at one time (Ebn Ezra, twins; Rashi, six children). That this was not unfrequent in Egypt we learn from Aristotle (Hist. Anim. vii. 4): "Often the women bring forth twins, as in Egypt. They even give birth to three or four children at a time, nor is this of rare occurrence; but five is the highest number, and there have been instances of such fruitfulness." Pliny (Hist. Nat. vii. 3) observes: "That three are born at a birth is undoubted; to bear above that number is considered as an extraordinary phenomenon, except in Egypt, where the waters of the Nile are fructifying." Maillet (Description of Egypt, i. p. 18) ascribes this fertility to the uncommon salubrity of the air in Egypt (see also *Seneca*, Quaest. Nat. iii. 25; *Strabo*, xv. 695; *Aelian*, Anim. iii. 33; *Plut.* Isid. 5; *J. D. Michaelis*, in his note to xii. 37, and *Stolberg*, History of Religion, i. p. 252; *Rosenmül.* Orient. i. p. 252, 253). Our text says, that *the land* was filled with the Israelites. It is impossible to understand hereby the *land of Goshen* alone, which comprises only the territory of the present province Esh Schurkiyeh, bordering, in the east, on the Arabian desert, and in the west, on the eastern branches of the Nile (see *Robinson*, Pal. i. p. 84, *et seq.*). For as, according to xii. 37, there were among the Hebrews 600,000 men capable of bearing arms, their whole population, including their wives, children and servants, must have amounted to between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 souls; and these cannot possibly have found abodes in the comparatively limited district of Goshen; the less so, if we consider that the Hebrews did not exclusively inhabit it, but that Egyptians lived among them, as appears from the words: "And every woman shall ask of her neighbour," etc. (iii. 22; see our note to ii. 5); and, from the distinct account in v. 12, where it is clearly related that the Hebrews were scattered over all the land of Egypt in order to seek straw for the manufacturing of bricks, we may safely infer that they were spread over the whole country.

8. אשר לא־ידע את־יוסף *who knew not Joseph.* Targum Onkelos translates דלא מקיים גזירת יוסף *who did not sanction the measures introduced by Joseph*; similarly Targum Jonathan and Jerusalem: דלא חכים ית יוסף ולא הליך בנימוסוי "*who did not regard Joseph, nor observe*

all his brethren, and all that generation. 7. And the children of Israel were fruitful, and increased abundantly, and multiplied, and [a] grew exceedingly strong; and the land was filled with them.

8. Now there arose a new king over Egypt, who knew

[a] *Engl. Vers.*—Waxed exceeding mighty.

his laws." The Talmud (Sotah 11 a., where the whole passage from verse 8, to the beginning of the next chapter is explained) mentions the different opinions of Rab and Schemuel on the meaning of the "*new king,*" the one understanding thereby literally another monarch, the latter only a crisis in the life and fates of the old sovereign. But although the verb ידע has sometimes the signification of "*to care, to be mindful*" (as Gen. xxxix. 6), it is here much more naturally to be understood in its usual and literal sense, *to know*. Nor is it necessary to have recourse to the talmudical interpretation (quoted by Rashi), "*he feigned to know nothing of Joseph's merits,*" or to that of Clarke and others, "*he disapproved of his system.*" From the circumstance that our text has מלך־חדש, and not מלך אחר, and from the verb ויקם, "Now there *arose*" (see Judg. ii. 10; Ps. lxxviii. 6), we may conclude, that *the new king* was not simply a successor of that Pharaoh whom Joseph had served as grand vizier, but that both were from *different dynasties;* which, in the earlier periods of Egyptian history, changed in rapid succession. Till the times of Sesostris (about 1450 B.C.) Egypt was not united under one mighty ruler, but it consisted of almost as many states as it comprised cities, or at least districts, without connection or unity. Although Thebes maintained, during a long epoch, a predominant influence, it had constantly to resist the dangerous and powerful rivalry of Memphis, which became, later, even the chief residence of the Egyptian kings, and to repel the hostilities of many other colonies, which, mostly founded and governed by priests, had sufficient resources to maintain their autonomy. These facts render the unravelling of the Egyptian history of this period, fabulous in itself, a matter of paramount, if not insuperable, difficulty, as the lists of kings which are preserved to us by Herodotus, Diodorus, Manetho and Eratosthenes, do not exhibit the *successive* rulers of *one* monarchy, but to a great extent the *contemporary* sovereigns of *different* smaller states, and we should almost consider an authentic enlightenment on this point hopelessly lost, in our time, were it not improper ever to despair of the possible results of scientific researches. But it will readily be perceived, from this dismemberment of the Egyptian territory, that foreign invaders could, without difficulty, attack and subdue the one or the other of those monarchies, and that their mutual jealousy encouraged such invasions, and facilitated the triumphs of the invaders. To a similar conquest by foreign enemies we are naturally led by the tenor of our text, for only such *new* king could be ignorant of the most eminent services Joseph had rendered to the commonwealth, a circumstance which would be absolutely unaccountable in one of the immediate successors of the same pharaonic house. And none was more deeply indebted to the devotion and ability of Joseph than the crown of Egypt. For at the bottom of the simple and unpretending narrative of the last ten chapters of Genesis, the experienced historian will easily discover a fundamental change, if not an internal revolution, of the Egyptian constitution, far more in favour of the kings than of the people. The authority of the former was, before this period, weakened, and their energy shackled, by the increasing influence of the two first castes, that of the priests and the warriors, against whose power and presumption they could only find a weapon, if the resources of the people, hitherto left to their own development, were secured for the aggrandize-

אֶל־עַמּוֹ הִנֵּה עַם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל רַב וְעָצוּם מִמֶּנּוּ׃ 10 הָבָה נִתְחַכְּמָה

ment of the royal revenues. This great consummation was effected by the ingenious measures of Joseph, by which almost the whole of the landed property of the people passed into the hands of the king, and even their persons came into his dependence; a translocation of the inhabitants alienated them from the soil of their ancestors, thus severing all their connection with the past; and the tax of the fifth part of their income filled the exchequer of the king. Thus the Pharaohs gained an enormous amount of property; their power was consolidated; and they could now easily defy the arrogance of the privileged and prepollent classes. In a word, according to the narration of Genesis, the financial revolution caused by Joseph, brought all territories, except the property of the priests, into the possession of the crown, and the inhabitants were, henceforth, but the lessees of this royal property (see *Eichhorn*, Introduction into the Old Testament, iii. § 418, 3; *Herod.* ii; *Diod. Sic.* i. 63, 73, 74; *Drumann*, Inscription of Rosetta, p. 157, 168; *Bohlen*, Old India, ii. 43, *et seq.*). Whatever the condition of the *people* might have been under such a change, is it in any way likely that the *kings* of the same dynasty, who followed that Pharaoh in due course and legitimate succession, should have forgotten the infinite obligations they owed to Joseph, or that they should have been ignorant of his merits?

This suggestion of a *new* king, from *another* dynasty, which offers itself spontaneously and *a priori*, is fully corroborated by weighty testimonies of history. For Josephus (against Apion, i. 14) relates, on the authority of Manetho, that, at a time which would well agree with the event alluded to in our text, troops of common invaders coming from the east (ἐκ τῶν πρὸς ἀνατολὴν μερῶν), and supposed by many to have been Arabians, conquered Egypt, and subdued her rulers. That invading tribe was called by the Egyptians, *Hyksos* (Ὑκσώς, *i. e.* βασιλεῖς ποιμένες), *shepherd-kings* (an appellation indicative of the contempt in which they were held by the Egyptians). After they had cruelly raged in all Egypt, they elected a king of the name of Salatis (Σάλατις perhaps from سلط to govern, to which root belongs the substantive Sultan, the sovereign). So far the account of Josephus. If we merely substitute the conquest of a part of Egypt (viz. of Lower Egypt, of which the land of Goshen formed a province) instead of the whole of Egypt, as we are, indeed, justified from Eusebius (Praep. Evang. ix. 27), we have, in these facts, a plausible narration of probable events; and if so, it is more than likely that Salatis was this *new* king alluded to in our text; he was not only *another*, but a *new*, a foreign king, (חדש in the signification of *foreign* is also found in Judges, v. 8, יבחר אלהים חדשים) unacquainted with, and naturally averse to, the partisans of the old dynasty. In such a new king alone the precautionary measures against the increase and influence of another tribe in the midst of his own dominions, are explicable, and receive their proper light (ver. 10). This view is further strengthened by the express remark of Josephus (Antiq. ii. ix. 1), that the Israelites were oppressed by the Egyptians, after the death of Joseph, *because the royal power had passed into another dynasty* (τῆς βασιλείας εἰς ἄλλον οἶκον μετεληλυθυίας).—*Bohlen* (Introduction to his work on Genesis, p. lxxx) raises the objection, that the biblical records speak positively against the rule of a foreign tribe during the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, "as they evidently describe the *native* Egyptians, with their non-semitic language, their aversion to shepherds and animal sacrifices, and their other well-known peculiarities." Without denying the truth and ingenuity of this remark, which would, however, much more apply to the time of Joseph and the patriarchs, than to the period of the "new king" in our text; it does in no way affect our supposition, as policy and pru-

not Joseph. 9. And he said to his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel *are* [3] more numerous and

[3] *Engl. Vers.*—More and mightier.

dence must have prescribed to the foreign usurpers the expediency of adopting the customs, and, in public transactions, the language of their new country, rather than of adhering to those of their native abodes; a system of accommodation especially practised by nomadic conquerors; as, for instance, the Mongols and Mantschus in China (see *Heeren* Ideas ii. p. 575—83), and almost invariably traceable in all instances when the conquered nation was superior to the conquerors in civilization.

From this exposition, it is self-evident, that the opinion of those who (like Schloezer, Eichhorn, and others leaning on the erroneous conclusions of Josephus) believe that the Hyksos were the Israelites, is perfectly inadmissible and perverse, an opinion which, among other arguments, could easily be refuted by the fact that, from the text of the Bible, we are in no respect justified to consider the descendants of Jacob as invaders, or conquerors of Egypt. That the Hyksos are not identical with the Hebrews, is clearly obvious from Josephus against Apion, i. 26, (see *Marsham*, Can. Chron. p. 113; *Beer*, "Of the Shepherds who reigned in Egypt," in his treatises for the elucidation of ancient chronology and history, i. 214, *et seq.*; *Jahn*, Archaeolog. ii. 1, 26; *Rosenmüller*, Antiq. iii. 311; *Ewald*, History of Israel, i. 457; *Lengerke*, Kenaan, i. 363, *et seq.*; *Salomon*, Commentary, p. 4). It is the opinion of Champollion, that this "nation of shepherds" invaded, and took possession of Egypt, or a part thereof, *before* the immigration of Joseph, and even that of Abraham, and that the first monarch of the diospolitan, or 18th dynasty, is meant by our "new king." But this conjecture would also militate against all the historical and rational arguments urged in our exposition. Winer (Real-Wörterbuch, i. p. 607), Jost (i. p. 94—98), and Lengerke (p. 364), likewise offer the supposition, that the Hebrews settled in Egypt *during* the reign of the Hyksos, and that the new dynasty, alluded to in our text, seized the government, after having expelled the Hyksos. But the former author himself hints at the chronological difficulty of this conjecture, as, according to Eusebius, between the accession of Aphophis (in Joseph's time) and the death of Amenophis (at the exodus), only 392 years elapsed, which would differ from xii. 40, by about forty years. *Cahen* quotes a chronological computation from the ספר המבחר, from which it would appear that between the death of Joseph, and the reign of the *new king*, a period of 59 years intervened. That calculation starts, however, from the erroneous supposition, that the birth of Moses was contemporary with the accession of that new king, whereas the same monarch must already have spent considerable time with the two first designs for the weakening of the Israelites anterior to the birth of Moses (see our notes to ver. 11 and 22). We cannot enter here more fully into the history of the Hyksos, and refer the reader for a more detailed exposition to *Heeren*, Ideas, ii. p. 577—586; *Hengstenberg*, the Books of Moses, and Egypt, p. 257—277, who is of opinion that the whole report about the Hyksos is an Egyptian fabrication; *Faber*, "On the Origin of Pagan Idolatry," vol. iii. book vi. chap. 5, who adopts the doubtful statement of Manetho (Josephus, *c.* Ap. i. 28) respecting a re-establishment of the Hyksos, 37 years after the death of Joseph, after they had once been expelled from Egypt, and settled in Philistia, 15 years before Joseph was sold into Egypt. (See our Introduction, § 3, i.).

9. "It is worthy of consideration, that the Egyptian king planned the means for crushing the power of the Israelites in common deliberation with his people, whilst the atrocious commands for checking their miraculous increase, are ascribed

לוֹ פֶּן־יִרְבֶּה וְהָיָה כִּי־תִקְרֶאנָה מִלְחָמָה וְנוֹסַף גַּם־הוּא עַל־שֹׂנְאֵינוּ

to his own tyrannical impatience" (Jost). Josephus (Antiq. II. ix. 1) mentions, as the motives of Pharaoh's cruel devices against the Hebrews, besides fear, also jealousy and envy, for "he saw the Israelites thriving and even gaining an ascendency over the Egyptians by their wealth, which they acquired by their temperance and activity." Abarbanel asks, "Were, indeed, the Israelites more numerous than the Egyptians? and, if so, why did the king fear them only in case of war, (ver. 10), and not likewise in peace, when they might have used their numerical superiority to attack him unexpectedly, and to subdue his people?" He is, therefore, of opinion, that ממנו refers only to עצום, not to רב, and that the former adjective is to be taken in the sense of bodily strength, so that the meaning of the verse would be, "behold, the people of Israel are numerous, and of more robust constitutions than we." But רב and עצום belong obviously to each other; they are, in the masoretic text, combined by a conjunctive accent; and the expression of Pharaoh implies an admirable psychological feature—the natural exaggeration of fear and precaution (see Ps. cv. 24).

10. הבה imperative of יהב to give, to come on, with ה paragogicum.—נתחכמה לו let us act with stratagem or precaution, for to massacre them openly, Pharaoh did not venture, on account of their multitude; not, as Abarbanel opines, because he shrunk from attacking a tribe which had sought refuge in his dominions; for the Egyptians were notorious for their inhospitality and aversion to strangers; the Septuagint translates aptly, *δεῦτε κατασοφισώμεθα αὐτούς*; see *Diod. Sic.* i. 56; *Plin.* Hist. Nat. xxx. 15. Even Homer describes the cruelty of the Egyptians against strangers, whom they "either killed, or preserved alive, in order to use them for slavish works" (*σφίσιν ἐργάζεσθαι ἀνάγκῃ*, see Od. xiv. 272, xvii. 441). כי־תקראנה מלחמה *if there happens any war.* The verb stands in the plural, whilst the subject מלחמה is in the singular, which latter word is here applied in a collective sense, "dangerous, critical times or circumstances." A similar construction occurs in 1 Kings v. 18, מפני המלחמה אשר סבבהו. That collective nouns are frequently construed with the plural, is natural and logical; such nouns are, עם, גוי, עדה, בית (family), צבא, etc. (see *Gesen.* Lehrgeb. § 184, 2). But Ewald (Hebrew Grammar, § 233, 3, note) classes the form תקראנה among those which are originally the *third* pers. *fem. sing.*, but take נה, in order to distinguish them from the same forms of the *second* pers. *masc.*; however, neither in our passage, nor in the other instances quoted by him (Job. xvii. 16; Isa. xxviii. 3; Obad. ver. 13) this rather unfounded supposition is necessary, as the plural can, in these passages, otherwise be accounted for. There remains, however, one phrase in Judges v. 26, ידה ליתד תשלחנה, where the plural cannot well be defended, and where we are compelled to take the plural תשלחנה instead of the singular תשלח. Even Gesen. (Lehrg. p. 800) seems to acknowledge in this passage the conjecture of Ewald, and aptly compares that form with the Arabic *futurum energeticum*, يَقْتُلَنْ. In his Grammar (§ 47), he compares this form much less happily with the French patois *j'avons* instead of *j'ai*, which vulgarity can certainly not be supposed in the sublime song of Deborah. Ebn Ezra takes these words as an elliptical expression instead of והיה כי תקראנה קורות מלחמה (accidents of war). As instances of a similar ellipsis are quoted Num. xxiii. 20, and Prov. xv. 22. But these cases are widely different from our passage; for the verbs ברך, and יעץ, have a natural supplement (ברכה and עצה) and admit of this one only, whilst קרא allows innumerable collateral supplements. Onkelos translates יערעיננא קרב, as if the Hebrew text were תקראנו מלחמה, which reading

stronger than we. 10. Come then, let us deal wisely with them; lest they multiply and it come to pass, that, when

the Samaritan codex indeed exhibits, and, according to which, the Septuagint also renders *ἡνίκα ἂν συμβῇ ἡμῖν πόλεμος*; and so our text is also interpreted by the Vulgate, the Syrian Version, Ludovicus de Dieu, Geddes (in Vater's commentary, who, moreover, adds superficially that the reading of the Hebrew text תקראנה would only be explicable as a Chaldaism). Kimchi is of opinion that the subject is to be repeated מלחמה ומלחמה, but he, later, abandoned this supposition himself, by proposing (*sub rad.* עוג) that תקראנה stands instead of תקרא לה, namely לעיר; but in our text not one town but the whole of Egypt is to be understood, and the *nun* would besides require a *dagesh forte* ונוסף גם־הוא על־שנאינו.—תקראנה *that they join also with our enemies.* The enemies of the shepherd-kings of Arabian origin, were the old Egyptians, the secret adherents of the former dynasty, with whom the Hebrews had long lived in friendly connection, and the Thebans, whom they were unable to annihilate or to subdue. The king feared, therefore, that the indigenous Egyptians might endeavour to shake off the foreign yoke by violent resistance, and obtain a powerful ally in the dissatisfied Israelites (see Rosenmüller). Hengstenberg supposes the enemies whom Pharaoh feared to have been the invading tribes of the Arabians, with whom the Israelites, who lived in the bordering district of Goshen, might make common cause for the overthrow of the Egyptian dynasty; see, however, our note to ver. 8. *And fight against us.* According to Manetho, the pastors occupied the delta of the Nile, whilst the Egyptians had been repelled to Thebais; the conquerors must, therefore, necessarily have feared that, at an attack of the Egyptians, the Hebrews might join them, and avail themselves of this confusion to quit the land. ועלה מן־הארץ *and go up out of the land.* עלה, to go up to the north, as ירד is to go down, to descend to the south; besides, Egypt lies lower than Palestine. See Genes. xlvi. 2, 3, etc.; comp. Lengerke, Kenaan, p. 35, note 2. The Syrian and Coptic versions have "and expel us from the land." Mendelssohn takes the conjunction ו in ועלה in the sense of או, *or* (like Exod. xxi. 15, ומכה אביו ואמו), that they fight against us, or at least leave the country. But it is evident, that the fear of Pharaoh was directed only to the latter possibility. The desire of the Israelites to return to the land of their ancestors, must, it appears, have become so strong that even the king of Egypt was informed thereof, and thought it necessary to devise plans to prevent the execution of their intention. "Every part of this declaration throws light upon the history, and serves to prove that the new king and his people were foreigners." Faber, iii. p. 553. We see in the words of our text no allusion to "laden with booty," as Maurer finds; but the king, although he apprehended the dangerous prolificacy and increase of the Hebrews, was unwilling to lose their very valuable gratuitous aid, which he greatly required for his gigantic architectural works (ver. 11). It was, besides, a point of national pride with the Egyptian despots, to execute their huge monuments and edifices by foreign workmen; and on one of the majestic temples which the great conqueror Sesostris erected, he ordered the inscription to be conspicuously engraved: "No native Egyptian has been employed in constructing this building" (Diod. i. 56). This circumstance was, according to Josephus (Antiq. II. xii. 2), particularly alluded to by Moses, when God commanded him to lead the Israelites out of Egypt; "How shall I be able," said he, "to persuade Pharaoh to allow *them* to depart, who, by their labour, so materially contribute to the promotion of national prosperity?" (see *Rosenmüller*, Antiq. iii. 310, *et seq.; Jahn*, Arch. ii. 1, 25; *Munk*, Palestine, p. 117, *a*).

וְנִלְחַם־בָּנוּ וְעָלָה מִן־הָאָרֶץ׃ 11 וַיָּשִׂימוּ עָלָיו שָׂרֵי מִסִּים לְמַעַן עַנֹּתוֹ בְּסִבְלֹתָם וַיִּבֶן עָרֵי מִסְכְּנוֹת לְפַרְעֹה אֶת־פִּתֹם וְאֶת־רַעַמְסֵס׃

11. We deem it advisable to preface the history of the Hebrew bondage in Egypt with the following preliminary remark. We are not entitled to suppose that the oppression of the Israelites in Egypt commenced immediately after the death of Joseph. The historical accounts on this point fluctuate between 80 and 400 years (Josephus, Antiq. II. ix. 1). The latter period is evidently too protracted, and "perfectly unhistorical," (Lengerke, Kenaan, p. 384) as the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt amounted only to 430 years (xii. 40). According to our supposition (ver. 8), the *new* king is a monarch of the foreign (Arabian) tribe of the Hyksos, who, after their usurpation, thought it a matter of expediency and policy to oppress the Hebrews, and paralyse their energies. Their extraordinary increase, and their increase *only*, was, to him, an object of apprehension, and he devised measures to stay it. But can the Israelites, already one or two generations after Jacob, be supposed to have increased to any formidable multitude? The oppressive measures must, therefore, have begun considerably later, although the Hyksos might have invaded and conquered the country (or a portion thereof) at a much earlier date; so that the period of the real and severe thraldom of the Israelites in Egypt may be assumed as considerably shorter than is usually supposed, but at least 100 years before the Exodus, see *Introd.* § 2, i. 1. Hales (II. i. 180) also believes that the Bible-chronology, which dates the commencement of the bondage of the Israelites immediately from Joseph's death, or 71 years after their settlement in Egypt, is in this point questionable, and he thinks that it ought to be dated at least 30 years, or one generation later. although one of his reasons, that the former period would be too small to bring Joseph into oblivion, is of no weight considering that *a new dynasty* followed on the Egyptian throne. So much may be unhesitatingly asserted, that the sufferings of the Hebrews were neither universal nor uninterrupted. "A general and perfect oppression of the Israelites in Goshen," says Jost (Hist. i. 76, 77) "did not take place. It is of importance to remark, that, except the few circumstances related in the Holy Books, no other fact is mentioned as an accompanying evil of that thraldom, so that the Egyptians appear to have had nothing in view but their own safety. Even the command to kill the new-born male children, seems not to have been executed (?) and was perhaps only intended as a threat. The duration of the oppression is unknown. . . . . The Israelites continued, nevertheless, to be herdsmen, and engaged in all occupations connected with such pursuits. In fact, there were always among them experienced workmen of every kind, as was manifest soon after their departure from Egypt. From all this we may conclude that the Egyptians neither robbed the property of the Israelites, nor intended their hostile destruction." In accordance with this view we read in Num. xi. 18, טוב לנו במצרים, "it was well with us in Egypt," (see 1 Chron. iv. 21, 23; vii. 21—24; *De Wette*, Archaeol. § 22; *Munk*, Palest. p. 116. *b*; *Lengerke*, Kenaan, p. 384, and our note to v. 4).

מס, although unquestionable in its signification (*tribute rendered by labour, servile work*), is of doubtful etymological origin (see *Gesen.* Thes., who takes it, with too little probability, as a contraction of מכס, from כסס to count, after the *Latin* and *Greek* analogy of Ajax and Αἴας, Alexander and Alessandro; but we know no instance of a similar contraction or assimilation in *Hebrew*). About the double plural in שרי מסים *superintendents of works* (which Onkelos renders more according to the sense than the letter, שלטנין מבאישין wicked, cruel overseers) see Gesen. Gram. § 106 3, *b*. They were

there happens any war, they join also with our enemies, and fight against us, [1]and go up out of the land. 11. Therefore they appointed over them task-masters, to afflict them

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—And *so* get them up out of the land.

the superior officers, to whom the נגשים (v. 6), or taskmasters were subordinated (see note to ch. v. 6).—מסכנות is derived from כנס, *to gather, congregate*, with a frequent transposition of letters (see Gesen. Gram. § 19, 5). ערי מסכנות means, therefore, *store cities* (see 2 Chron. xxxii. 28), so Mendelssohn; *Onkelos*, קירוי בית אוצרא; *Sept.* inaccurately πόλεις ὀχυράς, strong, fortified cities, because such places only were used as the depositories of corn; Vulg. urbes tabernaculorum, as if the Hebrew text were ערי משכנות. Salomon plausibly derives it from סָכַן, "to provide for somebody, support him," from which the participle סֹכֵן "treasurer," or steward, occurs, as a substantive, in Isa. xxii. 15. But he goes certainly too far in combining this root with מסכן poor, and מסכנות poverty, so that the ערי מסכנות are "magazines, in which corn for the maintenance of the poor was stored up." Clarke finds in מסכנות even an allusion to the pyramids, which the Israelites were employed to build, explaining, "places where Pharaoh laid up stores." See also Hengstenberg, the books of Moses and Egypt, page 32, 33, where מסכנות is brought into connection with the word *Manoskh*, signifying granary, or the place where the corn is measured, and frequently occurring on Egyptian inscriptions.— בסבלתם *with their burdens.* סבלות, from the singular סִבְלָה or סְבָלָה, is only used in the plural, and, being derived from סבל, to bear heavy burdens, signifies laborious and wearisome toils.—The tyrant of Egypt hoped to annihilate, by unremitting exertions and breathless labour, the energies and self-respect of the Israelites, so completely, that they would have neither the courage, nor the desire, nor the leisure, for planning schemes of deliverance. And justly remarks Aristotle (Polit. v. 11): "And it is also a policy frequently resorted to by tyrants, to make their subjects poor and miserable, . . . so that their whole attention is absorbed in gaining their daily bread, and no time is left them to think of stratagems for their redemption." From a similar principle, Tarquinius Superbus constantly occupied the plebeians with the construction of trenches and sewers (Liv. i. 56). (See Rosen. Old and Modern Orient. i. p. 253.) "Many of the Egyptian kings had, not a passion, but a fury, for building. To this propensity, however, Egypt owes a great number of monuments both of utility and embellishment." See note to ii. 10.— פתם *Pithom*, a city in Lower Egypt, on the east of the Nile, most probably the same town which Herodotus (ii. 158) calls *Patumos, the Arabian city* (Πάτουμον τὴν Ἀραβίην πόλιν, near Bubastis, now *Tell-Basta*, in the vicinity of the village Benalhassar), which phrase may imply a town of Egypt situated near the Arabic (Red) Sea; but we are certainly justified to understand it of an Egyptian city built by, or under the direction of Arabians, so that from this side also the supposition of the reign of the Arabian Hyksos in Egypt would be unexpectedly corroborated. According to Champollion (L'Egypte sous les Pharaons, ii. p. 58—62) the original name of Pithom was *Thoum* (enclosed, surrounded by mountains), the syllable *Pi* being the Egyptian article. "It seems," says he, "that it was situated to the south of Bubastis, near the spot where Bilbeis stands now (see *Munk*, Pal. p. 117, *b.* note 1; *Jomard*, Déscript. de l'Eg. ix. p. 368). Significant is the remark of Manetho, that the king Salatis fortified the eastern cities, and that he established a strong camp in *Avaris* (Αὔαρις), or *Abaris* (Ἄβαρις), in which he placed 240,000 soldiers, and which Ewald sagaciously conjectures to be identical with the camp of the *Hebrews* (see *Lengerke*, Kenaan, i. p. 361). רַעַמְסֵס, *Raamses.*

12 וְכַאֲשֶׁר יְעַנּוּ אֹתוֹ כֵּן יִרְבֶּה וְכֵן יִפְרֹץ וַיָּקֻצוּ מִפְּנֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃
13 וַיַּעֲבִדוּ מִצְרַיִם אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּפָרֶךְ׃ 14 וַיְמָרְרוּ אֶת־חַיֵּיהֶם
בַּעֲבֹדָה קָשָׁה בְּחֹמֶר וּבִלְבֵנִים וּבְכָל־עֲבֹדָה בַּשָּׂדֶה אֵת כָּל־עֲבֹדָתָם

This *town* is to be distinguished from the land or province רַעְמְסֵס, mentioned in Genesis xlvii. 11 and Exod. xii. 37, and evidently identical with גשן (see Lindenth., Raphall, etc., Genesis, p. 310, note *b.* and p. 317, note *f.* The objections of Hengstenberg, Moses and Egypt, pp. 48, 49, are not conclusive). It was *built* by the Israelites (not fortified, or re-built, as Gesenius and Rosenmüller are inclined to believe, for the verb בנה has nowhere indisputably that signification), and received its name from the frequent appellation of the Egyptian Pharaoh's *Ramses* or *Rameses*, the Son of the Sun (a proud surname assumed by other oriental sovereigns also); and later, the whole province in which it was situated, was called רַעְמְסֵס, (and in *Genesis* it is mentioned under this name by way of anticipation). *Jablonsky*, following the Arabic translation of Saadiah, who renders عين شمس believes Raamses to be identical with Heliopolis, which was formerly called און. But the Septuagint adds, after Ῥαμεσσῆ, the words καὶ Ὢν ἥ ἐστιν Ἡλιούπολις, thus showing that Raamses and Heliopolis are two different towns. According to Niebuhr (Travels, i. p. 97), a village of the name of Ramsis رعمسيس is still to be found between Cairo and Alexandria; so also Champollion (L'Egypte, etc., ii. p. 248). But the towns mentioned in our text cannot have been situated on the west of the Nile, as no crossing over this river is related in the history of the Exodus of the Israelites. Some (as *Hengstenb.* Moses and Egypt, p. 48, etc.; *Ewald*, Hist. of Isr. ii. 52; and *Lengerke*, Ken. p. 351) believe Raamses to be Heroopolis, but without any positive proof, merely leaning on the Septuagint version of Gen. xlvi. 28, 29. Lepsius (Letters from Egypt, etc. p. 438) remarks, "That we really have to seek for Rameses in the ruins of Abu-Keshed (north-east of Heliopolis) is most decidedly confirmed by a monument which was found among those very ruins as early as the time of the French expedition. It is a group of three figures cut out of a granite block representing the gods Ra and Tum, and between them the king Ramses II. (Ramses-Miamus, who begun the canal)." The Jerusalem Targum calls the two towns of our text ית טניס וית פילוסין Tanis and Pelusium, but both lie beyond the district of Goshen, and as the Israelites assembled in Rameses before the Exodus (xii. 37; Num. xxxiii. 3, 5), we must most probably seek them in that province. However this may be, the situation of Pithom and Raamses cannot, in general, be doubtful; they must have formed a part of Lower Egypt, in the east of the Nile, most apparently in the valley Vadi Tumilat, which is formed by the Nile and that chain of mountains which accompanies the Nile from the south to the north, and near the place where the canal began which combined the Nile with the gulf of Suez (Herod. ii. 158). This part of the country, which probably formed the most southern region of Goshen, was, on the eastern frontier, naturally exposed to the invasions from Arabia, and was, therefore, the chief quarter of the warrior-caste. Fortresses, used at the same time for corn-magazines, were thus, in these parts, not only advisable but indispensable (see 2 Chron. viii. 3—6, where the store cities are called "fenced cities, with walls, gates, and bars;" *Heeren*, ii. page 609; *Ritter*, Geogr. p. 829).

12. יפרץ. The root פרץ has certainly sometimes the signification of *increasing*, growing in number, as Hos. iv. 12; Gen. xxx. 30. But its usual meaning of *spreading* is by far more applicable here, serving, as it does, to show that the enormous number of Israelites were not confined to the comparatively limited district of Go-

with their burdens; and they built for Pharaoh [1] store cities, Pithom and Raamses. 12. But the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and [2] spread. [3] And they had a horror against the children of Israel. 13. And the Egyptians made the children of Israel serve with rigour. 14. And they made their lives bitter with

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Treasure cities. [2] Grew. [3] And they were grieved because of.

shen, but that they were used for the royal or public works almost throughout the whole of Pharaoh's dominions (see our note to ver. 7). The tenor of our text appears to corroborate our opinion. The words כן ירבה וכן יפרץ are co-ordinate, not to each other, as the repetition of כן shows, but to the preceding phrase וכאשר יענו אתו, and the sense is:—in the same proportion as the Israelites were oppressed, in the same degree they increased, and in the same degree they spread accordingly. Ebn Ezra, Rashbam and Rosenmüller see no gradation in the text, "Although the Israelites were so ill-treated, they increased like as in former days." But כאשר and כן are too obviously antithetical to be understood as simple correlatives.—ויקצו, from קוץ, combining the two notions of *disgust* and *fear; to feel horror.* The rendering of the English version, *they were grieved*, is, therefore, inaccurate as to the etymology, and inappropriate as to the context.

13. פרך, from the Arabic root فرك to diminish, to exhaust, so that the substantive signifies a diminution of strength, *oppression, tyranny* (Ges.). Similarly Rashi (בעבודה קשה המפרכת את הגוף ומשברתו); *Sept. Bíq.* The root פרך is used in the Talmud in various formations. Ebn Ezra sees in this verse a certain progress in the relation of the miseries of the Hebrews; first they had to build vast edifices and fortified towns for Pharaoh (ver. 11); but when he saw that even not this slavish and exhausting occupation impeded their miraculous increase (ver. 12), he allowed all his subjects (ויעבדו מצרים) to use them as slaves, and to treat them with every possible cruelty (ver. 13); and when he perceived, to his amazement, that this measure also had not the desired effect, he called the midwives, and gave them his barbarous and nefarious instructions (ver. 15).

14. In the latter part of this verse our translation varies from the English version, which renders the words את כל עבדתם וכ׳ (like several old translators), "all their service, wherein they made them serve, *was* with rigour," (so also Glaire); but this would be little more than a mere repetition of the preceding verse, besides the very rare use of את for the Nominative; we take, therefore, the latter particle as a copulative preposition, *together with* (see verse 1). Thus Rashbam explains here את by עם; Gesenius, (Thes.) translates *praeter* omne opus; and De Wette, together with Vater and Maurer, are of opinion that the words את כל עבדתם וכ׳ are governed by וימררו, "and they embittered all their labours." But this explanation would absolutely demand ו before את, even in poetry, much more in prose. עבד with ב, is here, as in a few other passages, used as a *transitive* verb, to make serve or work (so Jerem. xxii. 13, xxx. 8; Levit. xxv. 39). Onkelos renders עבדו with אפלחו exactly like ויעבדו in the preceding verse (see Ewald, Gr. § 545, 3).—חֹמֶר *mortar*, so called from being of a red colour (from the root חָמַר, Arabic حمر to be red). לבנה a brick, or burnt tile, so called from the white and chalky clay of which bricks were made, according to *Vitruv.* ii. 3, and *Plin.* Hist. Nat. xxxv. 14; Arabic لبن (Gesenius). These bricks, dried in the open air, assume

אֲשֶׁר־עָבְדוּ בָהֶם בְּפָרֶךְ׃ 15 וַיֹּאמֶר מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם לַמְיַלְּדֹת הָעִבְרִיֹּת

an extraordinary hardness, and, according to Herodotus (ii. 136), even a pyramid (which probably still exists near Faioum, in the erection of which most likely the Israelites were employed, and a drawing of which is given in the Déscription de l'Egypte) was built of such bricks. "There is a hill near Cairo formed entirely of broken tiles and pottery. Popular tradition refers its origin to the Israelites, and names it Tel Youdeh, or 'Hill of the Jews,'" (*Wilson*). See *J.E.Faber* in *Harmar's* Observations, iii. p. 43, *et seq.; Pocock*, Descript. Orient. i. p. 288; *Mannert*, Geography, x. 1; *Champollion*, Letters from Egypt, p. 14; *Rosellini*, I Monumenti dell' Egitto e della Nubia, II. ii. p. 249, etc., where is also given a highly interesting drawing, copied from the walls of a tomb near Thebes, and generally believed to represent the oppressed Israelites making bricks under the severe superintendence of the Egyptian taskmasters; compare, about this drawing, *Hengstenb.* Moses and Egypt, pp. 79—84; *Wilkinson*, Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians, ii. p. 96; *O. Müller*, Archæol. § 226. *Quatremère de Quincy* Etat de l'Architect. de l'Egypte, p. 64. Modern travellers (see *Wilkinson*, ii. 97) observe, that the bricks were, in Egypt, manufactured for the king or certain privileged persons. A vast number of strangers was always occupied in the brick-fields of Thebes, and other parts of Egypt. Josephus (Antiq. II. ix. 1) describes the labours of the Israelites as consisting in cutting canals, fortifying the cities with walls, raising dykes, and erecting pyramids. "Things are much the same now in the same country. Mehemet Ali, the Pasha of Egypt, obliged 150,000 men, chiefly Arabs from Upper Egypt, to work on his canal connecting the Nile with the sea at Alexandria; 20,000 of the number perished during the progress of the work" (Pict. Bible). Carne, (Letters from the East, p. 71, 72), writes, "We cannot be insensible to the cries of suffering raised by the children, women, and old blind men, and cripples, who are condemned, under the terrors of the club, to the severest labours. Having ridden out, early one morning, in the neighbourhood of Alexandria, we suddenly heard the sounds of music from without, and perceived it was the Pasha himself, with his guard, who had just arrived from Cairo. He was on foot, and stood on the lofty bank of a new canal he was making, earnestly observing the innumerable workmen beneath. The bed of the canal below presented a novel spectacle, being filled with vast numbers of Arabs of various colours, toiling in the intense heat of the day, while their Egyptian taskmasters, with whips in their hands, watched the progress of their labour. The wages allowed these unfortunate people . . . . were only a penny a day, and a ration of bread." Although Egypt is a highly fertile country, so much so that it is often called the universal store-house, and although the inundations of the Nile supersede the labours anterior to *sowing*, yet the soil requires a most careful and laborious cultivation by the aid of canals and other great draining preparations, and even now, very often, great numbers of workmen are employed to remove the morasses formed by the swellings of the Nile. To such hard and exhausting labours our text most probably alludes. About the difficulties with which the irrigation of the soil in Egypt is attended, we have an abundance of testimonies, of which we select here but the following brief remarks. Baehr (on *Herod.* ii. 14) observes, "there is scarcely any country on the earth which requires, for the purposes of agriculture, so much human labour as Egypt." Michaud (Correspondence from the Orient, viii. p. 54) remarks, "The labour of ploughing is the least exertion for the agriculturists of Egypt. The greatest difficulty consists in draining the fields, and the strongest among the fellahs are employed to carry the water, and to execute the irrigations." Such exertions were especially indispensable in the northern parts of Egypt, which the Israelites chiefly inhabited, and

hard bondage, in mortar and in brick, and with all manner of labour in the field, [1] besides all their *other* labour, which they made them work with rigour. 15. And the king of

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—All their service, wherein they made them serve, *was* with rigour.

thus Egypt was, not without reason, called *an iron furnace* (Deut. iv. 20. Jer. xi. 4); *a house of slaves* (Exod. xx. 2; Micah vi. 3); or, *the ignominy of Israel's youth* (Isa. liv. 4). See *Oedman*, various treatises, i. p. 126; *Shaw*, p. 172; *Girard*, xvii. p. 56; *Prokesh*, Recollections, ii. p. 135; *Paxton*, Illustr. of Script. Geogr. p. 195.

15. **למילדת העברית**. As Pharaoh could not possibly entrust to *Hebrew* women the execution of his plan aiming at the ultimate extirpation of their own race, we are compelled to suppose, with Josephus (Antiq. II. ix. 9), the midwives, not to have been of the Hebrew, but of the Egyptian nation; so that the first part of our verse is to be translated: "And the king of Egypt spoke to the women who served as midwives to the Hebrews," and מילדת is here to be taken rather in its verbal meaning as a participle, than as a substantive; thus translate the Sept. (*ταῖς μαίαις τῶν Ἑβραίων*) and Vulgate (obstetricibus Hebraeorum). The answer of the midwives in ver. 19, seems also to be favourable to our interpretation: "the Hebrew women are not like the Egyptian women," whom they, then, mostly delivered. The dispute in the Talmud, therefore, whether the two midwives mentioned were Jochebed and Miriam, or Jochebed and Elisheba, is superfluous. True, the names of the two midwives appear to be of Semitic, not of Egyptian origin (שפרה, splendour, beauty, from שפר, Arabic سفر, and פועה, Arabic فوهة); but as, according to our supposition, the king was one of the Arabic Hyksos, this circumstance offers no difficulty. But there is another objection, which has been urged with more apparent justice, and this concerns the *number* of midwives, two of whom could not possibly have sufficed for such a numerous people, which, about eighty years later, counted 600,000 men fit to bear arms (Exod. xii. 37), and 22,000 Levites (Num. iii. 39), and which, at the lowest estimate, must have consisted of 2,500,000 souls (see note to ver. 7). Ebn Ezra observes, therefore, "These two were the superintendents of all midwives; for there is no doubt that there were more than 500, and the former had to pay to the king a tax from their income." Abarbanel questions this opinion, and offers the hypothesis, that Shiphrah and Puah are not proper, but appellative nouns, denoting the two chief operations necessary or customary at every childbirth, so that, in each of such cases, two midwives were employed, one of either of these two classes, and that an indefinite number of midwives might, therefore, have been in activity. However, the opinion of Ebn Ezra seems to be more conformable to our text, as there is no objection to suppose that the king gave his orders personally to *two* chiefs, or overseers, of the midwives.

16. **ויאמר**. "The ויאמר of the 15th verse, being too much separated from its direct complement, is necessarily repeated before this complement" (Glaire) וראיתן על־האבנים. The English Version translates, "and see *them* upon the stools"; but this would require אתן to be supplied, which is here unnecessary. ראה is constructed with על, as in frequent cases, in the signification of looking upon something (see ver. 21). The version further begins the apodosis with *if it be a son*, taking the words וראיתן על האבנים to the first part of the verse, or the protasis; but this translation would rather require, instead of וראיתן, the infinitive ובראותכן, corresponding to בילדכן. The copulative ו is a usual sign of the beginning of the *apodosis* (as in Arabic و, see *De Sacy*, Gram. Arab. ii. § 551-556), for instance, Gen. iii. 5, ביום

אֲשֶׁר שֵׁם הָאַחַת שִׁפְרָה וְשֵׁם הַשֵּׁנִית פּוּעָה׃ 16 וַיֹּאמֶר בְּיַלֶּדְכֶן
אֶת־הָעִבְרִיּוֹת וּרְאִיתֶן עַל־הָאָבְנָיִם אִם־בֵּן הוּא וַהֲמִתֶּן אֹתוֹ וְאִם־בַּת
הִוא וָחָיָה׃ 17 וַתִּירֶאןָ הַמְיַלְּדֹת אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים וְלֹא עָשׂוּ כַּאֲשֶׁר
דִּבֶּר אֲלֵיהֶן מֶלֶךְ מִצְרָיִם וַתְּחַיֶּיןָ אֶת־הַיְלָדִים׃ שני 18 וַיִּקְרָא מֶלֶךְ־

אכלכם ממנו ונפקחו עיניכם, *in the day you eat thereof, your eyes shall be opened.* אבנים (dual of אֹבֶן i. q. אֶבֶן stone), *Engl. Vers.* stools, which translation is too indistinct, and disregards the etymology. The same is the case with the rendering of Kimchi, with the Arabic Version, and the explanation of Rashi: "אבנים is the seat of women in labour, which is elsewhere called משבר," in which exposition, besides, the identification of אבנים and משבר is erroneous (the latter being *os uteri* quod fetus nascens *frangit;* as in Isa. xxxvii. 3, באו בנים עד משבר וכח אין ללדה). Similarly interpret Onkelos, Rashbam and Rosenmüller (sella parturientis, confessing, however, that he is himself not satisfied with this explanation). The Septuagint and Vulgate give an indefinite paraphrase, "ὅταν ὦσι πρὸς τὸ τίκτειν; et partus tempus advenerit." Others infer from the passage in Jeremiah xviii. 3, והנהו עושה מלאכה על־האבנים (with regard to which Abulwalides observes, "lapidum par, quamquam non lapideum, propter similitudinem molae manuariae, quae lapidea esse solet"), that אבנים (originally the two mill-stones, viz. catillum et meta) is a stool, consisting of two round plates, which are in all parts in equal intervals from each other, and have the same mutual position as the two mill-stones. (Thus *Fuller*, in Miscell. Sacr. lib. v. cap. 19). But this explanation also is not very plausible. *Ebn Ezra* quotes and refutes the opinion of בן קריש that אבנים is composed of בנים (from בנה to construct) as the root, and the א prostheticum, like in אכזב from כזב. Nevertheless has *Hasse* (Magazine of Biblical and Oriental Literature, p. 62, and Rosenmüller accedes to his opinion), defended that conjecture, overlooking, 1st. that the א prostheticum had originally a Sheva, which might be converted into a short vowel like Patach or Segol, if the word begins with two consonants, but never into Kametz (for instance, אַכְזָר, אֶזְרוֹעַ, אֶגְרֹף. See Gesenius, Lehrg. § 35, 1); and, 2nd. That the signification of אבנים would be very vague and indistinct: "res structa, machina duabus partibus composita, quae rei alicui parandae inservit." The most probable opinion is that of Gesenius, who observes, "אבנים is a *washing-vessel of stone,* in which the Orientals used to wash new-born infants"; they appear to have resembled hand-mills, in being made of stones, the lower of which was hollowed, the upper serving as a lid. But the whole question is, in our opinion, completely set at rest by the remark of Thevenot (Travels, ii. p. 98); "The Persian kings order the new-born male infants of their relatives to be killed in the stone basins, in which the children, immediately after their birth, used to be washed, lest these offsprings, if allowed to live, become dangerous to their government." What is here limited to the relatives of the kings, Pharaoh naturally extended to the whole Hebrew race. In the face of such evidence, we can attach but little importance to an observation in a memoir of M. Larrey, quoted by Cahen, who describes אבנים as a sort of stool (fauteuil); see also *Geddes*, in Vater's Commentary. We add, merely for the sake of completeness, some other suppositions of modern critics, without being able to sympathise with them. Ewald (Hist. i. p. 481) translates, *on both wheels,* i. e. *speedily* (flugs), whilst Lee, Benary and Lengerke (Ken. p. 387) render

Egypt spoke [1] to the women, who served as midwives to the Hebrews; of whom the name of the one *was* Shiphrah, and the name of the other Puah: 16. And he said, When you do the office of a midwife to the Hebrew women, [2] you shall look upon the basin; if it *be* a son, you shall kill him; but if it *be* a daughter, then she shall live. 17. But the midwives feared God, and did not as the king

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Hebrew midwives. [2] And see *them* upon the stools.

"you shall be attentive to the two-fold possibility, whether the new-born child be a boy or a girl."—וַהֲמִתֶּן instead of וַהֲמִתֹּתֶן Hiphil of מות; see *Ewald*, Gr. § 364, *a.* *β.* 1.—וחיה is the third pers. fem. praeter Piel of חי, verb ע״ע, instead of חיי (Arabic حى), like גל, instead of גלל (not from חיה, the feminine of which would be חיתה, for which form Ebn Ezra, largely dilating upon the difficulty, believes it to be used, and which the Samaritan Codex really offers). The regular form would be חַיָּה, like סַבָּה, or in pause חָיָה, so that the only anomaly is the omission of the Dagesh in י; but similarly we find יִדְּמוּ, instead of יִדַּמּוּ, 1 Sam. ii. 9; יֻחָקוּ instead of יֻחַקּוּ, Job xix. 23; the Dagesh being compensated by the prolongation of the preceding vowel, as the future tense of סב is either יִסֹּב or יָסֹב (see *Ewald* Gr. § 438); others (Glaire) take it as the regular third pers. sing. mascul. of חיה, supposing here a change of gender.—Commentators raise the objection, why the cruel command of the king was not extended to the new-born girls also (and Abarbanel urges, that his plans required the extirpation of the latter still more imperatively), which objection they answer in different ways. Rashi writes (adopting the words of Tanchuma): "he felt uneasiness at the boys only because his astrologers had foretold him, that a boy would be born fated to rescue the Israelites." Abarbanel is of opinion that Pharaoh spared the women, in order to secure for himself, by their marriage with Egyptians, numerous soldiers and workmen; and Rosenmüller observes (on ver. 22) "the daughters could intermarry with other families." (See our note to ver. 11).

17. ותיראן המילדת את האלהים. The midwives feared rather the punishment of God than the anger of Pharaoh. It proves the rule of a sacred Providence, "that tyrants are not always served faithfully" (*Salom.*). It will not be surprising, that the midwives, who were *Egyptians* (see note to ver. 15), are described as *fearing God;* this expression signifies merely piety and righteousness, and is applied even with reference to heathens (see Genes. xx. ii; Ps. ii. 2). Justly, therefore, remarks *Hengstenberg* (Authenticity of the Pentateuch, i. p. 392); "It cannot be the intention of the author to express here the general notion of fear of God; for this was not the feeling, which guided the Egyptian midwives." ותיראן instead of ותיראנה, see *Gesen.* Gr. 547, note 3; *Ewald*, Gr. § 244, 1. *b.*

19. *Indeed* (כי) *the Hebrew women are not as the Egyptian women.* The particle כי might introduce here, as in many passages (and frequently in Greek ὅτι), the direct speech, and would, therefore, require no translation in English. A similar instance is in 1 Sam. x. 19 (ותאמרו לו כי מלך תשים עלינו), see *Gesen.* Gr. § 152; *Lehrg.* p. 846; compare also Exod. xviii. 15; Gen. xxix. 33; Ruth i. 10. But sometimes כי stands elliptically instead of חי אני כי, or a similar protestation, and is then to be translated by *indeed, verily* (for instance Isa. xv. 1). And such emphasis appears appropriate in our passage, in which the

מִצְרַיִם לַמְיַלְּדֹת וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶן מַדּוּעַ עֲשִׂיתֶן הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה וַתְּחַיֶּיןָ אֶת־
הַיְלָדִים׃ 19 וַתֹּאמַרְןָ הַמְיַלְּדֹת אֶל־פַּרְעֹה כִּי לֹא כַנָּשִׁים הַמִּצְרִיֹּת
הָעִבְרִיֹּת כִּי־חָיוֹת הֵנָּה בְּטֶרֶם תָּבוֹא אֲלֵהֶן הַמְיַלֶּדֶת וְיָלָדוּ׃
20 וַיֵּיטֶב אֱלֹהִים לַמְיַלְּדֹת וַיִּרֶב הָעָם וַיַּעַצְמוּ מְאֹד׃ 21 וַיְהִי כִּי־

midwives have to refute the criminal charge of disobedience to the royal command.—כי חיות הנה *for they are vigorous.* Rashi explains: "experienced like midwives" (בקיאות כמילדות); similarly Targum Onkelos (ארי חכימין אינין); Targ. Jonathan (ארום זריזין וחכימן בדעתיהן הינין); the latter, as well as Targ. Jerus., in their paraphrastical manner, add the prayer of the Hebrew women, which God graciously accepts; and Abarbanel, (יודעות מה שראויל עשות לילדיהן). The Talmud (Sotah 12) explains, "they resemble the animals of the field, which require no midwives," as if the text were כי כחיות הנה, and it is added, that the Jews are not unfrequently compared with animals (as גור אריה יהודה, אילה שלוחה, בכור שורו, זאב יטרף). Others take חיות in the signification of the Chaldaic word חיא, and the Syriac expression חיתא, both signifying midwife, so that the sense would be—the Hebrew women are themselves midwives and do not require our assistance; against which opinion Rosenmüller justly remarks, that the midwives are in this whole passage invariably expressed by מילדות, and it would be unaccountable why the author should just here introduce such unusual designation of the same notion. The most plausible explanation seems to be that of Ebn Ezra, כח חיים הרבה יש להן they have an extraordinary vitality, are exceedingly strong and *vigorous.* So Rashbam (בריאות ופקוחות וממהרות לילד), Rosenmüller, Maurer, and others. The rendering of the English version (for they are *lively*) does not meet the sense. The form חָיוֹת is used instead of חַיּוֹת, fem. plural of the adjective חַי; see our note on ver. 16.—*Before the midwife comes unto them they are delivered;* therefore, said the midwives, we cannot kill the new-born children, as we were commanded to do this secretly at their birth (See Mendels.). About the facility with which the women are delivered in the East, we read in Chardin's manuscript notes: "There are, in Asia, large districts in which no midwives are to be found, and even if some live there they are little known, for mothers assist their daughters, and often female relatives or neighbours fill the place of the former. In Karman, I saw a woman who was delivered without any assistance in the open field, three hours from a village, and, to my great surprise, she arrived not much later in the town where I was. The people there smiled at my astonishment, remarking that similar cases were very frequent in their country." (See *Rosenmüller*, The Orient, i. No. 188.) "Oriental women suffer little from parturition; for those of better condition are frequently on foot the day after delivery, and out of all confinement on the third day. They seldom call midwives, and when they do, they are sometimes delivered before they come to their assistance; the poorer sort, while they are labouring or planting, go aside, deliver themselves, wash the child, lay it in a clout, and return to work again" (*Dr. Paxton's* Illustrations of Scripture, i. p. 462). Clarke extends this facility of parturition to all parts of the globe, where the women labour hard, and especially in the open air.

20. "The first part of this verse is a real summary, which finds its explanation in the following verse" (*Glaire*). וַיֵּיטֶב,

of Egypt commanded them, and saved the male children alive. 18. And the king of Egypt called for the midwives, and said unto them, Why have you done this thing, and have saved the male children alive? 19. And the midwives said unto Pharaoh, [1] Indeed, the Hebrew women *are* not as the Egyptian women; for they *are* [2] vigorous: before the [3] midwife comes unto them, they are delivered. 20. Therefore God did well to the midwives; and the people multiplied and grew very mighty. 21. And it

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Because. [2] Lively. [3] Midwives.

future Hiphil of יטב (verb *proprie* פ"י); the Kal would be יִיטַב; see Gesen. Gr. § 69; Lehrg. § 105. B.—עם being a collective noun may be construed with the singular as well as with the plural. The construction in this verse, וירב (singular) ... ויעצמו (plural), corresponds with the Latin usage, where, generally, the first verb in connection with a collective noun is put in the singular, and the second in the plural; for instance, *Livy*, iv. 56: Ita omnium populorum *juventus* Antium *contracta;* ibi castris positis hostem *opperiebantur*. Thus *Livy* vi. 17; *Cicero*, De Nat. Deor. ii. 6; Pro Arch. 12; see *Zumpt*, Lat. Gram. cap. lxix. 2, note 1.

21. ויעש להם בתים, *that he made them houses.* The difficulty of these words lies first in the masculine suffix of להם, which evidently refers to the feminine substantive מילדות, for to bring it into connection with the collective noun עם in the preceding verse, would be a forced interpretation, implying a very unusual change of subject and object. But we find other instances, where the masculine of the suffix is manifestly and incontrovertibly used instead of the feminine, so Gen. xxxi. 9, where Jacob says to his wives ויצל אלהים את מקנה אביכם ויתן לי. An instructive instance is Exod. ii. 17 (ויבאו הרעים ויגרשום, the daughters of Reuel, ויקם משה ויושען וישק את צאנם). See also Exod. xi. 6; Ruth i. 8, 9, 11, 22; Judges xix. 24, xxi. 22; 2 Kings xviii. 16; Isa. iii. 16; Dan. viii. 9; 2 Chron. xxix. 3; compare 1 Kings xxii. 17, and 2 Chron. xviii. 6, further 1 Sam. xxxi. 7, and 1 Chron. x. 7; Gesen. Lehrg. p. 731; Ewald, Crit. Gr. p. 643; *Onkelos* renders ועבד להן בתים.—Another uncertainty is the meaning of בתים. The Talmud (and Rashi accordingly), which, as we have observed, on ver. 15, believes Jochebed and Miriam to have been the midwives, explains: God determined to make them the mothers of priests (בתי כהונה), Levites (בתי לויה), and kings (בתי מלכות). But we have proved that we are, from internal reasons, compelled to consider the midwives as Egyptians, and we are, therefore, of opinion, with Rosenmüller, Philippson and others, that בית is used here, as frequently in other passages, in the sense of *family* (for instance ii. 1), and the meaning would be, God increased and strengthened the families of the midwives as a reward for their piety. The sense will, however, be still more distinct and powerful, if we take בית, as is usual in oriental phraseology, as a symbol of well-established prosperity, firmly rooted happiness; so that the words of our text would imply the meaning: God blessed the midwives with every felicity. This explanation receives the fullest corroboration from 2 Sam. vii. 27, 29, where the promise "I will build thee a house" (בית) is explained and qualified by the words "to bless the house of thy servant, that it may continue for ever before thee." We need, therefore, not refute the interpretation of Mendelssohn, adopted by

יָרְאוּ הַמְיַלְּדֹת אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים וַיַּעַשׂ לָהֶם בָּתִּים׃ 22 וַיְצַו פַּרְעֹה
לְכָל־עַמּוֹ לֵאמֹר כָּל־הַבֵּן הַיִּלּוֹד הַיְאֹרָה תַּשְׁלִיכֻהוּ וְכָל־הַבַּת
תְּחַיּוּן׃ פ
ב 1 וַיֵּלֶךְ אִישׁ מִבֵּית לֵוִי וַיִּקַּח אֶת־בַּת־לֵוִי׃ 2 וַתַּהַר הָאִשָּׁה

Herxheimer, who connects this verse with the following, refers להם to עם, and translates: "Als nun die Hebeammen Gott fürchteten und Gott neue Häuser in der Nation entstehen liess; da gebot Pharaoh seinem ganzen Volke," etc.

22. כל־הבן הילוד. *Every son that is born.* Targum Onkelos renders "Every son that will be born to the Hebrews;" and similarly Targum Jonathan; the Sept. adds also τοῖς Ἑβραίοις; but not so the rabbinical tradition, according to which *all* children, both of the Egyptians and Hebrews, were to be thrown into the Nile, as the astrologers of Pharaoh had predicted that the deliverer of the Israelites was about to be born, without being able to inform him whether he would be an Egyptian or a Hebrew. The probability is, however, undoubtedly on the side of the Targumim; see our introductory note to ver. 11; and *Lengerke*, Kenaan, p. 388.—יאור *Nile*, viz. ὁ ποταμὸς κατ' ἐξοχήν, see Winer, Bibl. Dict. ii. 153—156. It is remarkable, that Pharaoh ordered the Nile to be infested with so many human corpses, as that river was, on the one hand, devoutly worshiped as a superior deity (see on vii. 15) and, on the other hand, its tasteful floods (the more acceptable as they were the only drinkable water in Egypt) were the delight and the pride of the Egyptians (see on vii. 18). Clarke and Osburn conjecture, but with little plausibility, "that Pharaoh intended the young Hebrews as an offering to his god, the Nile." ילוד verbal adjectives of the form of שכור , גבור (Ebn Ezra).

If we glance once more at the different means which Pharaoh devised for the oppression and diminution of the Hebrews, we find that they imply the following climax of severity and cruelty: he first endeavoured to break their energy by labour and hardship (ver. 11—14), then to effect their diminution by killing the new-born male children through the midwives (ver. 15, 16); and when neither of these plans had the desired result—the former in consequence of the unusual robustness of the Hebrew women, the latter owing to the piety and compassion of the midwives—he tried to execute his design by drowning the young children (ver. 22); which last device was in two respects more audacious and impious than the second; first, because he now, laying aside all shame, showed publicly his despotism against a harmless foreign tribe, which relied on the hospitality solemnly promised to them; and, secondly, because now the *whole people* were let loose against the Hebrews; spying and informing was made an act of loyalty, and compassion stamped as high-treason.

CHAPTER II.

Summary.—Jochebed bore to Amram a son, who, after having been hidden by the parents during three months, was exposed in the Nile. He was seen and saved by the daughter of Pharaoh, who called him Moses, and adopted him as her son. Grown older, he killed an Egyptian who had ill-treated a Hebrew; and when the report of this deed reached Pharaoh, Moses was obliged to flee; he went to Midian, where he married Zipporah, the daughter of Reuel; she bore him two sons, Gershom and Eliezer. A new Pharaoh, who, during the protracted sojourn of Moses in Midian, had succeeded to the throne, aggravated still more the oppression of the Hebrews; their cries ascended to God, who was mindful of the Covenant made with their ancestors.

1. בית לוי the same as בני לוי; the progeny of a family, the descendants of an ancestor, and, therefore, sometimes construed with the plural, Isaiah, ii. 5,

came to pass, because the midwives feared God, that He made them houses. 22. And Pharaoh charged all his people, saying, Every son that is born you shall cast into the river (Nile), but every daughter you shall save alive.

Chap. II. 1. And there went a man from the house of

וילך .... ויקח — בית יעקב לכו. The verbs of motion often introduce merely the narration of an action expressed by another verb immediately succeeding, see Gen. xxxv. 22; Deut. xxxi. 1; Isa. viii. 1; Hos. i. 3. The Sept. translates here simply, *Ἠν δέ τις ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Λευί* (see *Introduction*, § 2, i. 2.).—את־בת־לוי *a daughter of Levi*; i.e. one from the tribe, or the descendants of Levi, as the Sept. correctly translates (*ἐκ τῶν θυγατέρων Λευί*). The names of Moses' parents, which are here omitted, are fully stated in vi. 20; ויקח עמרם את יוכבד דדתו לו לאשה ותלד לו את אהרן ואת משה: "And Amram took Jochebed his father's sister to wife; and she bare him Aaron and Moses" (see Justin. xxxvi. 2). According to the literal tenor of the text Amram, the son of Kohath, was the grandson of Levi, and he married, therefore, his father's sister, the daughter of Levi, or his aunt. Although such alliance is forbidden by the Mosaic law (Lev. xviii. 12, ערות אחות אביך לא תגלה שאר אביך היא), it was,—according to Abarbanel—predestined by the special providence of God; besides, *before* the legislation on Mount Sinai, such marriages were *not* unlawful. The Septuagint, however, thought it necessary to translate there דדתו with *θυγατέρα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ*—patruelem suam—the daughter of his father's brother, or his cousin; an unjustifiable deviation from the text, which, however, is approved by Ewald (Antiq. p. 175, note 1). Ebn Ezra remarks, here, what he more appropriately would have reserved to that passage in Leviticus: "Those are not correct, who urge, that the produce of a field, sown on another field thrives, whilst if sown on the same field it does not thrive; for the principal object of these prohibitions is chastity, by which the Israelites shall become a holy nation" (see however, on this verse, *Introduction*, § 2, i.). According to the opinion of several ancient commentators, as Rashi, Jochebed was 130 years old when she bare Moses; for they follow the tradition that she was born exactly at the time of the immigration of Levi into Egypt (see note to i. 5); the whole duration of the sojourn of the Israelites there, they assert, was 210 years; Moses was 80 years of age at the time of the Exodus (vii. 7); and $210-80=130$. But this would imply a wonder by far more miraculous than that of Sarah, who laughed sceptically at the idea of being a mother at the age of 90; and no circumstance is mentioned in our text to indicate that such a miracle took place. More plausible is, therefore, the opinion of Abarbanel, who, rejecting that tradition concerning the birth of Jochebed in the *literal* sense (and assigning to it a symbolical meaning) asserts, that Levi was, at the time of the immigration into Egypt about 44 years old; that Jochebed was born to him 26 or 36 years later, and as Moses was 80 years old at the departure from Egypt, she bore him between the age of 50 and 60, which would not be extraordinary or astonishing. However, this calculation is erroneous, for he computes $210-(44+26+80)=60$; but the 44 years, being the age of Levi at the period of immigration, cannot be taken into account, as they have no reference to the birth of Moses by Jochebed, who thus would yet, after this calculation, become mother at the unusual age of 100 or 110 years. This difficulty might simply be removed by the supposition that Jochebed was born 70 or 80 years after the immigration (for Levi attained the age of

וַתֵּלֶד בֵּן וַתֵּרֶא אֹתוֹ כִּי־טוֹב הוּא וַתִּצְפְּנֵהוּ שְׁלֹשָׁה יְרָחִים׃
3 וְלֹא־יָכְלָה עוֹד הַצְּפִינוֹ וַתִּקַּח־לוֹ תֵּבַת גֹּמֶא וַתַּחְמְרָה בַחֵמָר
וּבַזָּפֶת וַתָּשֶׂם בָּהּ אֶת־הַיֶּלֶד וַתָּשֶׂם בַּסּוּף עַל־שְׂפַת הַיְאֹר׃

137 years, see vi. 16, thus living 93 years after that event): so that Jochebed would have been between 50 and 60 years old at the time of the birth of Moses; see, however, on this whole subject our above-quoted exposition, in the *Introduction*. The edict of Pharaoh ordering the male children of the Israelites to be cast into the Nile, must have been enforced a considerable time after the marriage of Amram and Jochebed, as their daughter Miriam was at the birth of Moses already an adult virgin (עלמה, ver. 8), and Aaron, who was three years older than Moses, does not appear to have been exposed to any danger at his birth, of which, therefore, no mention is made in our text. According to a tradition that edict was in force during 3½ years (See Abarb. on chap. i. at the end).

2. Rashbam justly refutes the usual translation of ותרא אתו כי־טוב הוא, "and when she saw him that he was a goodly child" (Engl. Vers.), "und da sie sah, dass es ein fein Kind war" (Luther, and similarly Mendelssohn and De Wette); for Jochebed, the mother, would have been perfectly as anxious for the preservation of her child, had it been less fine or less strong. That interpretation would, indeed, almost remind us of the barbarous custom of the Spartans, who killed their children if they did not appear to them sufficiently robust (*Plut.* Life of Lycurgus). Therefore, the two parts of this verse ותרא and ותצפנהו, must not be brought into a causal connection, but are simply co-ordinate: "and she regarded him, that he was a goodly child, and she hid him three months." We can, thus, not even approve of Rosenmüller's mitigated expression: "Misericordiam auxit, ut solet, infantis forma eximia." טוב is here (as Gen. vi. 2; 1 Sam. ix. 2; Isa. v. 9, etc.) "good to look at, fine, beautiful," and is used in this signification of persons as well as of things. Tradition gives a variety of conjectural explanations of the meaning of טוב, about which we refer the reader to Philippson's remarks to this verse. Comp. also *Joseph.* Antiq. II. ix. 6,7.

3. הַצְּפִינוֹ, infin. hiph. of צפן *to hide*, with the suffix, an irregular form instead of הַצְפִּינוֹ; the *Dagesh* in צ is *Dagesh euphonicum*, indicating with greater force that the syllable is short, and used especially before one of the letters, ב, ג, ד, כ, פ, ת. (See *Ges.* Lehrg. p. 86, 87).—גֹּמֶא a marsh rush, especially *papyrus nilotica* (from גָּמָא to absorb, swallow); so called because it absorbs and drinks moisture; whence it is called by Lucanus (iv. 136) *bibula papyrus*. The Egyptians used it to make garments, shoes, baskets, and utensils of various kinds, especially boats (Plin. xiii. 21—26; compare Isa. xviii. 2). (*Ges.*) "It is distinguished by its cluster of elegant little spikes, which consist of a single row of scales, ranged in a straight line on each side. These clusters are weak, or hang down in a nodding position, and, unlike the rest of the plant, are inapplicable to any useful purpose. The root is about the thickness of a full sized man's wrist, and more than fifteen feet in length, and so hard that all kinds of utensils were made of it. The reed-like triangular stem is about four cubits, or six feet long, was eaten raw, roasted, or boiled, and served as material for boats, sails, mats, clothes, beds, and books" (Pict. Bibl.). It is further known, that the inner rind was manufactured into a writing material, called *paper*, from this plant. One of the modes of preparing it, according to Pliny, was this:— "The fine pellicles, which divided naturally, were slit into flakes, and being laid upon a table, were pressed together, the glutinous juice of the plant binding it, so that when it was dried, it became fit for

Levi, and took *to wife* a daughter of Levi. 2. And the woman conceived, and bare a son: [1] and she saw that he *was a* goodly *child;* and she hid him three months. 3. And when she could not longer hide him, she took for him an ark of bulrushes, and daubed it with [2] bitumen and with pitch, and put the child therein; and she laid *it* in the flags by

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—And when she saw ... she hid. [2] Slime.

use."—"The durable qualities of this material have been tested by the discovery of Egyptian and Greek manuscripts, written on papyrus, which can be unrolled or handled without injury, after having been deposited in the cases of mummies or in earthen jars, in the tombs of Egypt, for many long centuries." See *Rosenm.* Orient. i. p. 257; *Herod.* ii. 96; *Plut.* Is. and Osir. p. 395; *Lucan*, iv. 136; *Pliny*, H. N. xvi. 36; iv. 22; *Theophrastus*, iv. 9; *Wilkinson*, Manners, iii. p. 62.—חמר, Arab. حمر *ἄσφαλτος*, *bitumen* (from חמר to ferment, to be red), which boils up from subterranean fountains like oil or hot pitch, in the vicinity of Babylon, and also near the Red Sea; it afterwards hardens through the heat of the sun, and is collected on the surface of the Dead Sea, which hence receives the name of *Lacus Asphaltites* (*Tac.* Hist. v. 6; *Strabo*, xvi. p. 763; *Diod.* ii. 48; xix. 98, 99; *Curt.* v, 16; and *Rosenm.* Orient. i., No. 24, 31). It receives its name either from its *boiling up* from the fountains (see Gen. xix. 19), or from *redness*, the best kind being of that colour; *Diosc.* i. 99, *ἄσφαλτος διαφέρει ἡ ἰουδαϊκὴ τῆς λοιπῆς· ἐστὶ δὲ καλὴ ἡ πορφυροειδῶς στίλβουσα ... γεννᾶται καὶ ἐν Φοινίκῃ καὶ ἐν Σιδῶνι καὶ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι καὶ ἐν Ζακύνθῳ* (*Gesen.*). See *Herod.* i. 179; *Joseph.* Antiqq. i. 4; *Plin.* xxxv. 51; *Vitruv.* viii. 3; *Rosenm.* Antiqq. i. 2, p 48. From this description of חמר it will be evident, why we have substituted in our translation *bitumen* instead of *slime*, which the Engl. Version offers. From this substantive the verb חמר has here the signification of *bituminavit*, to daub with asphaltum or bitumen.—The suffix ה in ותחמרה has no *Mappik*, which is indicated by the *Raphe* over it (so, הוסדה, Exod. ix. 18. See Num. xv. 28; Job xxxi. 22).—זפת *pitch*, Arab. زفت, from the root זוף to flow, to pour. See Wilkinson, iii. p. 186. The ark was daubed with bitumen from within, in order to protect the child from the sharp bulrushes; and with pitch from without, in order to prevent the water from penetrating into the ark. (Similarly Rashi, Rashbam, Abarb., and others.)—ותשם בסוף, viz. אותה and she laid *it*, the ark, which accus. is here to be supplied.—סוף *a rush*, *alga nilotica*, called by the Egyptians, *sari*. *Plin.* H. N. xiii. 23, describes it thus:—"The *sari* grows in the marshy parts of Egypt, or in the stagnant water that remains behind after the inundation of the Nile. From the root springs up an oblique stalk, as thick as an arm and triangular; it rises ten yards high, and ends at the top in a kind of tuft or bunch of flowers, which are only applied for wreaths in honour of the gods. The Egyptians use the root as we do wood, not only as fuel but also as material for vessels. From the rush itself they make boats; and the bark is used for sails, tiles, clothes, and ropes."—Abarbanel raises the question, why Jochebed exposed her son in the river, thus delivering him up to death, which was the only aim of the tyrant's cruel odict; so that nothing worse could have happened to the child than her own device. Of the four reasons which he offers in reply, one appears especially conclusive: that by hiding her son longer she would have brought upon herself and her whole family also a certain death, as having contravened the royal decree, without, by all

4 וַתֵּתַצַּב אֲחֹתוֹ מֵרָחֹק לְדֵעָה מַה־יֵּעָשֶׂה לוֹ׃ 5 וַתֵּרֶד בַּת־
פַּרְעֹה לִרְחֹץ עַל־הַיְאֹר וְנַעֲרֹתֶיהָ הֹלְכֹת עַל־יַד הַיְאֹר וַתֵּרֶא
אֶת־הַתֵּבָה בְּתוֹךְ הַסּוּף וַתִּשְׁלַח אֶת־אֲמָתָהּ וַתִּקָּחֶהָ׃ 6 וַתִּפְתַּח

this, saving the child. Ebn Ezra, who, like all old interpreters, sees naturally the special finger of God in the miraculous incidents of Moses' childhood and youth, gives, in his own lucid and philosophical style, expression to this conviction in the following manner: "Deep are the dispensations of God; and who can penetrate into His mysteries! By Him all actions are weighed and ordained in infinite wisdom. It was perhaps His inscrutable intention, that Moses should be educated at the royal court, that his mind might receive the highest possible culture, and his spirit might remain uncurbed by the oppressive and enervating influence of slavery. Thus we read, that he killed the Egyptian, because his noble heart could not see violence and injustice; and from the same generous motives, he assisted the daughters of Reuel against the insolence of the shepherds. And further, if he had always lived among his brethren, and if they had known him from his childhood, they would not have felt for him that respect and reverence which was so essential for the accomplishment of his great mission." In a similar sense writes Schiller (Die Sendung Moses, x. p. 414, 415): "An Egyptian by birth would have lacked the requisite patriotic impulse, the national interest for the Hebrews, to attempt their deliverance. A mere Hebrew, on the other hand, would, under his oppression and thraldom, scarcely have had the energy and courage indispensable for such an arduous undertaking. What device did, therefore, Providence choose? It selected an Israelite, but withdrew him in his early infancy from the miseries of his people, and enabled him to store his mind with all the treasures of Egyptian wisdom; and thus the Hebrew, brought up as an Egyptian, became the instrument by which that nation was redeemed from its slavery." (See, however, our note to ver. 10.)—The history of the birth, preservation, and education of Moses has, on account of its unusual character, been described as a fable and the offspring of imagination. It is true, that similar accounts are given with regard to the infancy of other celebrated individuals of antiquity, as of Semiramis (*Diod. Sic.* ii. 4), Cyrus (*Herod.* i. 113; *Justin.* i. 1), Romulus (*Liv.* i. 4), Augustus (*Sueton.* cap. 94), and others. But these accounts, evidently replete with adventurous and incredible incidents, differ widely from the truthful narration of our text, which, indeed, contains nothing that even the most sceptical mind can deem impossible, especially if the customs of ancient Egypt, and the circumstances of that particular epoch of her history, are taken into due consideration. (See *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. ii. p. 110.)

4. ותתצב instead of ותיצב, fut. Hithpael of יצב; the radical י is elided (as in the Piel, from וידו, Lament. iii. 53, instead of ויידו, see *Gesen.* Lehrg. p. 386); as a mark whereof the first ת has assumed a Zere (see *Ewald*, Gram. § 121), as if simply a transposition of י and ת had taken place (*Schultens*, Gram. p. 470; *Vater*, Gram. p. 271).—אחותו, *his sister*, according to *Joseph.* Antiq. II. ix. 4, Miriam.—לדעה, *to know*, an unusual form of the Infin. Kal of ידע, instead of לדעת, which the Samaritan translation really has; the difference in both forms is immaterial, עה and עת both being feminine terminations. ידע is used here in its original signification, *to see*, like Gen. iii. 7, "and their eyes were opened, and they *saw* (וידעו) that they were naked (see *Ges.* Thes. p. 570).

5. *And the daughter of Pharaoh went down to bathe at the river.* The Egyptians, especially the women, show their veneration for the Nile, which is held sacred on account of its incalculable im-

the bank of the Nile. 4. And his sister stood afar off [1] to see what would be done to him.

5. And the daughter of Pharaoh went down [2] to bathe at the river, and her maidens walked by the river's side;

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—To wit. [2] To wash herself.

portance for the prosperity of the country, by immersing in it at the time when it begins to rise. Perhaps the daughter of Pharaoh went to the Nile in order to perform this religious ceremony. The time would agree with this supposition, for the Nile begins to swell in Lower Egypt about the middle of June, and as, according to tradition, Moses was born on the seventh day of Adar, he was then about three months old (see *Herod.* ii. 37; *Rosenm.* Orient. i. note 190). Now, in general, the women were not so restricted in Egypt as in other parts of the Orient (see *Herod.* ii. 3).—רחץ is here an intransitive or reflective verb *to bathe*, like 2 Kings v. 12, 13; Ruth iii. 3; Arab. رحض. Clarke proposes to take רחץ here in the signification of *washing clothes or linen*, and quotes, as a parallel, the Homeric narrative about Nausicaa, daughter of king Alcinōus, hinting even at the possibility, "that Homer made the Hebrew story the basis of the 6th book of the Odyssey." But the mania of seeking the Bible in Homer, Plato, Virgil, Plutarch, and almost all heathen writers, who happen to utter any analogous idea, or to relate any like occurrence, or to use any similar metaphor, is now fairly exploded, and is, in fact, so thoroughly uncritical, that we should consider it a waste of time to attempt any kind of refutation; besides, to wash *garments* is never רחץ, but כבס (see *Ges.* Thes. p. 1284).—Targum Onkelos and Targum Jonathan translate the word ותשלח את־אמתה with "and she stretched out her arm," as if the Hebrew text were אַמָּתָהּ. Rashi, Ebn Ezra, Rashbam and others justly reject this rendering, which is shared by no other translator or commentator, and which, indeed, not only gives to the word אמה a very unnatural signification, but militates against the traditional text.—Josephus, who, like Philo, adorns the circumstances connected with the birth of the legislator with legendary and poetical embellishments, calls the name of Pharaoh's daughter Thermuthis [Θέρμουθις], (Antiq. II. ix. 5), which, according to *Cahen*, might be identical with *Tomrots*, a name recently deciphered on an Egyptian monument (Précis du Système Hiéroglyphique, p. 21, No. 176). *Eusebius* (Praep. Evang. ix. 27) calls her name Merrhis (Μέῤῥις). The narration of the Koran about Moses (28th Sura), is a mixture of the statements of Josephus and the Midrash explanations, in the usual incoherent and unhistorical manner of that volume. As a curiosity, we add, that Artapanus represents Moses, as a pupil of Orpheus, and asserts, that the priests gave him the surname Hermes, on account of his hermeneutical skill in the interpretation of the holy books; (Ἑρμῆς διὰ τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων ἑρμηνείαν, see *Euseb.* Praep. Evang. ix. c. 26). So busy has the imagination been to shed a fabulous halo round the head of the lawgiver, who does not require fictitious splendour, to be glorious and immortal. From the circumstance that the daughter of Pharaoh came to bathe in that part of the Nile where the child was exposed, it would appear that Amram lived near, or in the royal residence, or that the latter was, at least temporarily, in Goshen. We have already observed (on i. 7), that, on the one hand, the land of Goshen was not exclusively inhabited by Israelites, and that, on the other hand, these might partly have been scattered over different parts of Egypt, and that they assembled in Goshen only at the time, and for the purpose of the Exodus.

וַתִּרְאֵהוּ אֶת־הַיֶּלֶד וְהִנֵּה־נַעַר בֹּכֶה וַתַּחְמֹל עָלָיו וַתֹּאמֶר מִיַּלְדֵי
הָעִבְרִים זֶה׃ 7 וַתֹּאמֶר אֲחֹתוֹ אֶל־בַּת־פַּרְעֹה הַאֵלֵךְ וְקָרָאתִי
לָךְ אִשָּׁה מֵינֶקֶת מִן הָעִבְרִיֹּת וְתֵינִק לָךְ אֶת־הַיָּלֶד׃ 8 וַתֹּאמֶר־
לָהּ בַּת־פַּרְעֹה לֵכִי וַתֵּלֶךְ הָעַלְמָה וַתִּקְרָא אֶת־אֵם הַיָּלֶד׃
9 וַתֹּאמֶר לָהּ בַּת־פַּרְעֹה הֵילִיכִי אֶת־הַיֶּלֶד הַזֶּה וְהֵינִקִהוּ לִי
וַאֲנִי אֶתֵּן אֶת־שְׂכָרֵךְ וַתִּקַּח הָאִשָּׁה הַיֶּלֶד וַתְּנִיקֵהוּ׃ 10 וַיִּגְדַּל

6. ותראהו את־הילד, *She saw the child.* The suffix הו is added pleonastically, the substantive to which it refers, following immediately. Similar instances are, 1 Sam. xxi. 14, וישנו את טעמו, he changed his behaviour; Job xxix. 3, xxxiii. 20; Ez. x. 3; Esth. vii. 3; Jer. ix. 25, etc. See *Gesen.* Lehrg. § 195. 2. Rashbam explains these words thus: "and she opened the ark, and examined the child (for ילד is epicene, boy or girl), and behold! it was a boy, a boy of the Hebrew race, which she inferred from his being circumcised." But it is well known, that, besides other nations, the Egyptians also circumcised their children (Jerem. ix. 25: Herod. ii. 36; *τὰ αἰδοῖα ὧλλοι μὲν ἐῶσι ὡς ἐγένοντο πλὴν ὅσοι ἀπὸ τούτων ἔμαθον. Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ περιτάμνονται.* See *Bohlen*, Genesis, p. 190—196). Ramban observes, more plausibly, that the fact of seeing the child exposed in the Nile naturally recalled to her mind the royal edict against the new-born Hebrews.—והנה־נער בכה. The Version translates, "and, behold, the babe wept;" which would grammatically require the definite article before נער; we must, therefore, render, "and behold, it was a weeping boy;" the Septuagint translates concisely, *Ἀνοίξασα δὲ ὁρᾷ παιδίον κλαῖον ἐν τῇ θίβῃ.*

7. *Shall I go and call to thee a nurse of the Hebrew women?* that is, a nurse who neither feels antipathy against the Hebrew child, nor will treat it carelessly, for both were to be apprehended from an Egyptian nurse (Rosenm.) see ver. 8. תינק, fut. Hiphil of ינק, verb *originally* פ״י, which preserves, therefore, in Hiphil, the י, not changing it into ו, see *Gesen.* Lehrg. § 105, *B.*

8. It has often been alleged, not without some specious probability, that the holy mission for which Moses was destined, did not allow him to be nursed by an Egyptian woman, but from this point of view his education at the idolatrous court of the Egyptian king would be equally unaccountable. "The princess objected to an Egyptian nurse, from fear that he might be neglected, or even delivered up by her to the officers of the king" (*Gerlach*). Perhaps an Egyptian nurse might even have refused to take care of a child of the persecuted and detested race of the Hebrews.

9. היליכי Targum Onkelos, הא ליכי, en tibi! here is, take here; thus Saadiah هاك, both identifying הי with הא (Gen. xlvii. 23), and ליכי with לך. But Ebn Ezra justly rejects this very artificial interpretation, and explains היליכי as the Imperative Hiphil of הלך, instead of הוליכי (הלך being conjugated like a verb פ״י, see *Gesen.* Lehrg. § 105, B. note 1). The Septuagint renders, "take charge for me of this child" (*διατήρησόν μοι τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο*), against the etymology of the verb.—ותניקהו is the fut. Hiphil of ניק=נוק (*Ebn Ezra*, *Rosenm.* *Gesen.* and others). Rashbam is of opinion, that ותְּניקהו is abbreviated from ותֵּניקהו, which form would, of course, likewise belong to the root ינק (see ver. 7).

10. *And the child grew*, that is, was

and when she saw the ark among the flags, she sent her maid servant [1] and she took it. 6. And when she opened it, she saw the child; and, behold, [2] it was a weeping boy. And she had compassion on him and said, This *is one* of the Hebrews' children. 7. Then said the sister to Pharaoh's daughter, Shall I go and call to thee a nurse of the Hebrew women, that she may nurse the child for thee? 8. And Pharaoh's daughter said to her, Go. And the maid went and called the child's mother. 9. And Pharaoh's daughter said to her, Take this child away, and nurse it for me, and I will give thee thy wages. And the woman took the child and nursed it. 10. And the child grew, and she brought him unto Pharaoh's daughter, and

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—To fetch it. [2] The babe wept.

weaned, which was done among the Israelites, as among the Egyptians and other Eastern nations, when the child was three years old, see 2 Maccab. ii. 28. Compare 2 Chron. xxx. 16; Koran ii. 233, xxxi. 13. According to rabbinical authorities, however, the child was weaned when it had completed its second year (see *Kimchi*, ad Gen. xxi. 8); and Morier ("A second Journey through Persia," etc. p. 107) relates, that the Persians suckle the boys two years and two months, but the girls only two years. The day of weaning the child is usually celebrated in the East with repasts and convivial festivities (compare Gen. xxi. 8), and was, in later periods of the Hebrew history, attended with the offering of a sacrifice on the part of the mother (see 1 Sam. i. 24), and is still, in Persia, connected with certain religious ceremonies. See also *Mungo Park*, Travels, p. 237.—*And he became her son*, Targum Jonathan renders "he was dear to her like a child." But Ebn Ezra already observes, that he was called her son, because she brought him up; Compare 2 Sam. xxi. 8. "Thermuthis, the king's daughter, perceiving him to be so remarkable a child, adopted him for her own, having no child of her own. And when, one time, she had brought and presented Moses to her father, she said that she intended to make him her father's successor, if it should please God she should have no legitimate child of her own" (*Josephus*, Antiq. II. ix. 7).—The incidental remarks of Josephus (loc. cit., compare *Philo*, Vita Mos. i. § 3), that "Moses was educated with great care," and of St. Stephen (Acts vii. 22), "that he was educated in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," (*ἐπαιδεύθη πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Αἰγυπτίων*), have continually led many critics to deduce almost the whole system of the Mosaic legislation from Egyptian sources, to consider it merely as a local adaptation of Egyptian statutes, in which Moses, by his admission into the caste of priests, and his initiation in their mysteries, was deeply versed, and thus to deprive Mosaism of every originality in many of its most essential points, (see even *Heeren*, Ideas, ii. p. 647). It is obvious, that such insinuations, if true, would strike a fatal blow against the value and the origin of the whole religious code of the Pentateuch. It is, therefore, of the highest importance to examine whether, and how far, the legislation of Moses is based on, or derived from, Egyptian institutions and notions. The reader will find our remarks on this point in a supplementary note at the end of this chapter.

And she called his name Moses (משה), *and she said, Because I drew him out*

הַיֶּלֶד וַתְּבִאֵהוּ לְבַת־פַּרְעֹה וַיְהִי־לָהּ לְבֵן וַתִּקְרָא שְׁמוֹ מֹשֶׁה
וַתֹּאמֶר כִּי מִן־הַמַּיִם מְשִׁיתִהוּ׃ שלישי 11 וַיְהִי ׀ בַּיָּמִים
הָהֵם וַיִּגְדַּל מֹשֶׁה וַיֵּצֵא אֶל־אֶחָיו וַיַּרְא בְּסִבְלֹתָם וַיַּרְא

(משיתהו) *of the water.* The etymology and meaning of the name Moses (who is called by the Septuagint and Josephus Μωϋσῆς, the Vulgate, Moyses, the Arabians موسى), is naturally much disputed; for the explanation given in the text "because I drew him out of the water" would require, not the *active* form משה, but the *passive* participle משוי. The former would rather imply the notion of a general leading the people of Israel from Egypt, an *archageta* (see *Jad Joseph* fol. 69, *a*; *Hüllmann*, p. 68; *Bohlen*, Genes. Introd. p. lxxxii). Besides, it is questionable that the Egyptian princess should have given to her adopted son a *Hebrew* name, whilst Joseph received from Pharaoh the undoubtedly Egyptian appellation צפנת פענח (revealer of mysteries) Gen. xli. 45. Antiquarians and historians have, therefore, justly endeavoured to trace the name of Moses to an Egyptian origin; and Josephus already observes (Antiq. II. ix. 6) "He received his name from the particular circumstances of his infancy, when he had been exposed in the Nile; for the Egyptians call the water *mo*, and one who is rescued from the waves, *uses*" (τὸ γὰρ ὕδωρ μῶ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι καλοῦσιν, ὑ σ ῆ ς δὲ τοὺς ἐξ ὕδατος σωθέντας). The Septuagint, which renders Μωϋσῆς, has, therefore, accurately preserved the etymology. Similarly *Josephus* c. Apion, i. 31; *Philo*, De Vita Mosis, ii. p. 83; *Suidas*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, Stromat. i. 148; *Ezechiel Tragicus*; *Eusebius*, Praep. Evang. ix. 9, 28, and others, whence Moses has sometimes been called ὑδογενής, "filius aquæ, the son of the water" (see *Jablonsky*, Opusc. i. 1. p. 157; *Salmasius*, De Annis Climacter. p. 614; *Ign. Rossius*, Etymolog. Aegypt. p. 127 *et seq.*). Now this name, originally Egyptian, has, then, been adapted to the genius of the Hebrew idiom, and referred to the Hebrew root משה to draw (Rashi, Rashbam), with which it has the greatest resemblance in sound, although it is of rare use (occurring only thrice in the Old Test.), although the form is grammatically not correct, and the principal and essential notion (water) is not expressed in the word. Although Gesenius approves of this explanation, he proposes (Thesaurus, p. 823) another conjecture, in our opinion of a much more artificial and complicated nature, namely, that according to the analogy of most of the Egyptian proper nouns, which are compounded with names of their deities, Moses has a similar meaning as *Amenmôs*, the son of Ammon; or *Harmôs*, the son of Hor, or *Rhamôs*, the son of the sun (môs signifying *son*), but that the first part of the name was omitted in the language of daily intercourse. Other writers, also desirous to secure for the lawgiver an original Egyptian name, assert, that he was called Mosheh (משה) by the Hebrews only, but that the Egyptians knew him under the name of Osarsiph (Ὀσαρσίφ), the priest of Osiris; (*Manetho* apud Josephum *c.* Apion, i. 28), or Tisithen (Τισιθέν, Chaeremon, ibid. § 32) or Hermes (Ἑρμῆς, *Artapan.* apud Euseb. Praep. Evang. ix. 27), or Menes (מוניוס, Ebn Ezra), against which opinion Abarbanel strongly objects, admitting, however, that Menes, or a similar Egyptian epithet signifying *the wise* or *great*, might have been given to Moses as an *appellative* surname after the great miracles which he performed before Pharaoh, and his wise measures had become generally known in Egypt. Such a wide field of conjecture was opened concerning the real Hebrew name of the lawgiver, that the Talmud (Sotah 12, Meg. 3) enumerates no less than nine different names (Heber, Jekuthiel, Jered,

he became her son. And she called his name Moses, and she said, Because I drew him out of the water. 11. And it came to pass in those days, when Moses was grown, that he went out unto his brethren, and looked on their

Sanoah, Abigdor, Abisocho, Shemajah, Tobiah, Nathaniel), believed to have been given to him by the different members of his family, and the people of Israel. He received, no doubt, a Hebrew name at his circumcision, or certainly during the three months of his concealment in the house of his parents (see *Jad Joseph*, 69, a. *Paxton*, Illustr. i. p. 470). Abarbanel considers משיתהו as the second person feminine, and not as the first person, so that the sense would be, "the mother Jochebed, when bringing her child to the daughter of Pharaoh, called his name Moses, for, said she, you have drawn him out of the water." Although the form משיתהו admits of this interpretation (but not from the reason stated by Abarbanel, who believes, that the first person would require משיתיהו; for the former is only the *scriptio defectiva*, the latter the *scriptio plena* of the same form; see Exod. xxxi. 11; xxxiv. 18, צויתך, xxxviii. 8, צויתם); the change of the subject in the same sentence, although not without parallels, would here be singularly forced; and it would, further, be surprising, if Jochebed, who was not known to the princess as the mother of the child, but only as his paid nurse, had given the name instead of the princess herself, to whom that privilege belonged according to the ancient customs of adoption.

11. *And it came to pass in those days.* In which year of Moses' life the consequential facts related in the following verses happened, is left indefinite in the context. A considerable number of years must have elapsed (wherefore the Septuagint renders "It was after *many* days"; so also Clericus and Rosenmüller); but to decide the precise period in the life of Moses must remain mere conjecture. An old tradition asserts that every forty years there was an important crisis in the fates of Moses; he led the Israelites from Egypt in his 80th year; he died in his 120th year; therefore, it is added, he was probably forty years old when his flight to Midian took place. The same number of years is mentioned in Acts vii. 23 (see *Wettstein* on our passage; and *Eichhorn*, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 186, note). Josephus, in accordance with the uncritical taste of his time, fills up this long interval till the flight of Moses with various events and deeds, to which we find no allusion in our text, but which are partly misrepresentations of Egyptian or Greek sources, and partly inventions of a fertile imagination. He relates, in his Antiquities (II. x), "The Ethiopians had invaded and devastated the territory of the Egyptians. The latter marched with a numerous army against them, but were completely defeated. They consulted the oracle, which advised them to confide the leadership of the war to Moses, the Hebrew. After deliberate and extensive preparations, he entered upon the expedition; his march led him through the vast desert, which was infested with all kinds of serpents and vermin; he purified it by storks and ibises which he had taken with him for that purpose. On his arrival in the hostile dominions, he took, after a persevering and skilful siege, the town Saba, later called Meroe; and the royal princess, Tharbis, was so captivated by his talent and manly energy, that she offered him spontaneously her hand; he accepted it, and led her in triumph back to Egypt as his legitimate wife." That this narrative bears the character of legendary invention, and that it cannot claim historical authenticity, needs scarcely to be remarked. The military skill which Moses had, at a later period, as the leader of the Hebrews, occasion to exhibit, seemed to presuppose some previous experience and practice in the operations of war, whereas

אִישׁ מִצְרִי מַכֶּה אִישׁ־עִבְרִי מֵאֶחָיו׃ 12 וַיִּפֶן כֹּה וָכֹה וַיַּרְא
כִּי אֵין אִישׁ וַיַּךְ אֶת־הַמִּצְרִי וַיִּטְמְנֵהוּ בַּחוֹל׃ 13 וַיֵּצֵא

the genius of Moses, inspired by the dictates of his great mission, did not necessarily require such preparatory exercise; and the statement that he married the Ethiopian princess Tharbis, has, no doubt, its source in the statement contained in Numbers xii. 1. that Moses took an Ethiopian wife (כשית); but he did this evidently during the journeys through the Arabian desert, and not before the Exodus from Egypt; for Cushites lived in Arabia also (see *Forster*, in Epist. ad J. D. Michaelis, pp. 5 and 19, *et seq.*, who vainly endeavours to vindicate the historical character of the Ethiopian expedition of Moses, and offers the hazardous supposition that the latter was a contemporary of Sesostris, whom he accompanied on all his distant expeditions, and that he became thus acquainted with the locality of Paradise). The "Book of the Chronicles of Moses" differs from the relation of Josephus in some particulars, the most remarkable of which is, that Moses was proclaimed king of the Ethiopians in his thirtieth year, which dignity he maintained during forty years; and after this period he fled to Midian, where he was imprisoned seven years by Jethro, and then united in marriage with his daughter Zipporah. Abarbanel observes, that all these allegations might be facts, but that they have been omitted in the text, because they have no connection with the sacred mission of Moses, which forms the exclusive contents of the four latter books of the Pentateuch (see *Introduction*, § 2. ii). However, for the estimation of these and similar accounts, we submit to our readers the following unequivocal and determined remark of Ebn Ezra (on ver. 22), "And I declare to you, as a rule, all books which are not written by prophets, or according to authentic tradition, deserve no credit whatever, yea, they contain even sentiments militating against reason and common sense; and such works are the Book of Zerubbabel, and the Book of Eldad, the Danite, and the Book of Chronicles of Moses, and similar writings," (see also *Ewald*, Hist. of Isr. ii. p. 71).

When Moses was grown (ויגדל משה), that is, when he had become a man full of vigour and intelligence; the similar phrase, in the preceding verse, signifies only his growing to the usual age of weaning (Rashbam). *He went out unto his brethren;* for the mystery of his birth had, perhaps by his parents, been disclosed to him, and, although educated in all the luxuries of an Eastern court, he had preserved a feeling heart for the sufferings of his brethren; he went from the palace to enquire into their condition, and he sympathised with their afflictions with all the ardour and energy of a noble and generous mind.—וירא בסבלתם, he gave his attention, applied his mind to their oppressive labours, which grieved his heart (Rashi). A similar use of ראה with ב, occurs in Gen. xxi. 16; xliv. 34. See *Gesen.* Gram. § 151. iii. 2; *Ewald*, Gr. § 478, i. *a.*—*And he saw an Egyptian smiting a Hebrew, one of his brethren.* Royal taskmasters (נגשים) were appointed to control and urge on the Hebrew labourers, as the delegated officers of a superior despotic power. They appear to have often abused their authority, and treated the Hebrews with degrading and revolting cruelty (see our notes to v. 6, 10, 14, 15). The Egyptian smote (מכה) the Hebrew, but did not kill him, as the surviving Israelite alone could have divulged the resolute action of Moses, related in the following verse; (*Acts* vii. 24. *ἰδών τινα ἀδικούμενον*), although the same verb has in the following verse undoubtedly the signification of killing, as in Ps. cxxxvi. 17. מאחיו, the Septuagint adds *τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ*, whilst Ebn Ezra explains "from his family," after the analogy of אנשים אחים, which explanation is partly shared by Rosenmüller; but the conception of the word

burdens, and he [1]saw an Egyptian smiting a Hebrew, *one* of his brethren. 12. And he [2]turned this way and that way, and when he saw that *there was* no man, he slew the Egyptian and hid him in the sand. 13. And

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Spied. [2] Looked.

אחיו in its general meaning appears here more appropriate; so also Philippson.

12. The impetuous anger, and the summary revenge practised by Moses, in which some writers have seen the violent action of a true descendant of his passionate ancestor Levi (Gen. xlix. 5—7), will not surprise those who consider that the position of the Egyptians to the Hebrews, was that of violence, not of right; justice was not to be expected against the arbitrariness of the Egyptian officers, whose rigour was countenanced and even sanctioned and enjoined by their superiors. In such a state of public affairs stratagem is to be met with stratagem, and force with force, according to the *right of the stronger* (le droit du plus fort, see J. J. Rousseau in his Tractat Social; H. Grotius; J. Ward, etc.); and the deed of Moses—who, in a generous impulse of the moment, risked his high station, and even his existence, for the cause of justice and innocence—belongs to those which history records as noble and magnanimous. "Despair and vengeance are the dreadful resources of the oppressed; and few men, suffering under a common yoke of slavery, would hesitate to punish on a tyrant a wrong done to their fellow, even as if it were done to themselves" (Wilson). And although there were certain kinds of Hebrew magistrates in Egypt, as *the elders* (iii. 16, and our note on the passage) and the *Shoterim*, the general registrars (see our note on v. 16), they had not sufficient authority to enforce their decrees; the weaker part had no hope to obtain justice by legal means; and all facts agree to justify the opinion that the Israelites were in a lawless position. And according to Diod. Sic. (i. § 17) there was an Egyptian law, enforcing that he who saw a man killed, or violently assaulted on the highway, and did not endeavour to rescue him if he could, was punished with death (see a more figurative explanation of our verse in Abarbanel's note on this passage).—*And hid him in the sand.* In Egypt and Arabia, men not unfrequently find their death in the sand driven and accumulated by the wind (Lengerke). If the corpse of the Egyptian had been found in the field, his avengers of blood, or relations, would have searched after the murderer, and delivered him up into the hands of justice (Abarbanel). The Koran, which, in almost all particulars, follows Jewish traditions, although often freely and inaccurately (see *Geiger*, "Was hat Mahomed aus dem Judenthum aufgenommen?") adds, after the relation of this deed of Moses: "But soon repenting of it, he exclaimed, 'This is a work of Satan, who is an open seducer and fiend,' and he prayed, 'O my Lord, I have sinned; pardon me, I beseech Thee.' And God forgave him, for he is compassionate and all-merciful." From all this we must reject the remark of Cahen, "This deed, although, dictated by a legitimate indignation, shows that Moses was still in the effervescence of youth, and under the influence of an African climate;" we find, in the conduct of Moses, rather a corroboration of the opinion of Göthe (West-Oestl. Divan, p. 162), "a strong sense of justice and injustice is the principal feature in the character of Moses;" compare *Maimonides*, Moreh Nebuch. ii. 45. And should, further, the whole transaction not justify us in supposing that an unformed idea of rescuing his brethren from the Egyptian yoke filled and occupied, even then, the mind of Moses?

13. *The second*, the following, *day* (Acts vii. 26, τῇ τε ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ).—*Two men*, according to a tradition, Dathan and Abiram; against which assumption, how-

בַּיּוֹם הַשֵּׁנִי וְהִנֵּה שְׁנֵי־אֲנָשִׁים עִבְרִים נִצִּים וַיֹּאמֶר לָרָשָׁע לָמָּה
תַכֶּה רֵעֶךָ׃ 14 וַיֹּאמֶר מִי שָׂמְךָ לְאִישׁ שַׂר וְשֹׁפֵט עָלֵינוּ הַלְהָרְגֵנִי
אַתָּה אֹמֵר כַּאֲשֶׁר הָרַגְתָּ אֶת־הַמִּצְרִי וַיִּירָא מֹשֶׁה וַיֹּאמַר אָכֵן
נוֹדַע הַדָּבָר׃ 15 וַיִּשְׁמַע פַּרְעֹה אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה וַיְבַקֵּשׁ לַהֲרֹג
אֶת־מֹשֶׁה וַיִּבְרַח מֹשֶׁה מִפְּנֵי פַרְעֹה וַיֵּשֶׁב בְּאֶרֶץ־מִדְיָן
וַיֵּשֶׁב עַל־הַבְּאֵר׃ 16 וּלְכֹהֵן מִדְיָן שֶׁבַע בָּנוֹת וַתָּבֹאנָה וַתִּדְלֶנָה

ever, Abarbanel objects, that we find, later, God commanding Moses to return from Midian to Egypt, "because all, who sought his life, were dead" (iv. 19) whereas Dathan and Abiram outlived that period considerably.—נצים Part. Niphal of נצה, to strive one with another, corresponding with the Arabic root نصا to quarrel with violence (see *A. Schultens* Animadvers. Philolog. ad hunc locum). רשע, culpable, guilty, like הצדיק רשע, to acquit the guilty (see Exod. xxiii. 7), and the reverse הרשיע רשע, to condemn the guilty; *Targ. Onkelos*, לחיבא; *Sept.* τῷ ἀδικοῦντι; *Vulg.* "ei qui faciebat injuriam;" *Mendels.* "zu dem Ungerechten," "The first action of Moses was to punish the oppression of his brethren (ver. 12), the second is to restore harmony among them (ver. 13)" (Cahen).

14. *A superior and a judge* (איש שר ושפט). The substantive איש is added to other substantives, as a mere apposition, without in any way affecting the meaning of the latter, as in the phrases איש סרים, a eunuch (Jerem. xxxviii. 7), איש כהן, a priest (Levit. xxi. 9), אשה אלמנה a widow (1 Kings vii. 14). Abarbanel finds in these words a climax of a particular stress: "thou art not a *man* of valour (איש), but a feeble youth; not a *prince* (שר), the son of a princess, as thou, perhaps, haughtily imaginest, but one of the oppressed people of the Hebrews; not a judge (שפט), prominent above thy brethren, but like the meanest among them.—*Dost thou intend* (אמר) *to kill me?* The verb אמר is often used in the signification of אמר בלבו, to reflect, consider, intend. "Uneducated persons, especially those of a lively temper, and children, generally speak out what they think, and what occupies their mind, therefore the language makes often no difference between thinking and speaking, and either notion is expressed by the same word; so שיח, הגה, and φημί, in Homer and the Greek tragedians" (*Gesen.* Thesaur.). Others translate less aptly: "Is it, perhaps, because you wish to kill me, that you speak so?"—אכן, originally infin. absol. Hiphil of כון, instead of הכין, or הכן, *establishing*, here *surely*, as Gen. xxviii. 16; Jerem. viii. 8; *Targum Onkelos* and *Jonathan:* בקושטא in truth, in fact, indeed. But the *Septuagint* and *Ebn Ezra* render: if so (εἰ οὕτως, אם כן); *Rashbam*, but so (אך כן); *Vulgate*, how (quomodo)—all less plausible than the explanation given above.

15. Moses was compelled to flee; for manslaughter was, in Egypt, inexorably punished with death (Diod. Sic. i. 6). And although the avenging of blood might have been lawful in Egypt, Moses could not class his action under that category; because the Egyptian had only beaten, not killed, the Israelite (see ver. 11); and if even the latter had been the case, Moses would have been exposed to the same danger, because he had exercised that right in favour of the detested Hebrew race, whose extermination was the cherished aim of the Egyptian despot, in whatever way it might be attained.—*And he dwelt in the land of Midian: and he sat down by a well.* "The text relates, first, the general event of his sojourning in Midian, and proceeds then to describe

when he went out the second day, behold, two Hebrews contended together, and he said to him that did wrong, Wherefore smitest thou thy fellow-man? 14. And he said, Who made thee a superior and judge over us? Dost thou intend to kill me as thou hast killed the Egyptian? And Moses feared and said, Surely the thing is known. 15. Now when Pharaoh heard this thing, he sought to kill Moses. But Moses fled from the face of Pharaoh, and dwelt in the land of Midian: and he sat down by the well.

the details of that event." (Mendelssohn, who translates accordingly: "Und blieb im Lande Midian. Er sass nämlich bei einem Brunnen," etc. And similarly already Ebn Ezra). Abarbanel explains less appropriately: "And when he had dwelt in the land of Midian many years, he happened once to sit by a well." *The land of Midian* (מדין), so called from one of the sons of Abraham and Keturah (Gen. xxv. 2, 4), extended to the south and east of Canaan; from the eastern coast of the Elanitic gulf of the Red Sea to the territory of the Moabites in the north, and the region of Mount Sinai in the south (see *Relandi*, Palest. p. 98, *et seq.*; Seetzen, xx. 300). A town, Madianu, or Modiana, is mentioned on the coast of the Elanitic gulf, which was already destroyed in the time of Edrisi and Abulfeda, who, nevertheless, notice the very well where the daughter of Schoaib, as the Moslems call Jethro, went to water the flocks, and saw, for the first time, her future husband (see *Christ. Rommel*, Abulfedae Arabiae Descript. p. 78; *Herbelot*, Bibl. Orient. iii. 273, *et seq.*). Josephus, who continues systematically his fanciful narration, names a city, Madiene (Μαδιηνή), on the Red Sea, as the locality of the following events. It is, however, questionable, whether the Midianites of our text really lived in these regions; the more so, as later we find Midianites mentioned between Edom and Paran (1 Kings xi. 18). It is, perhaps, more probable, to suppose with Rosenmüller (Antiq. iii. 95), besides those Midianites who formed the principal stock of that tribe, and who were engaged in commercial pursuits (see Gen. xxxvii. 25—28), another more nomadic and pastoral ramification of the same people in the Arabic desert between mount Sinai, Edom and Canaan. For it is not unusual with originally nomadic tribes, that some portions separate themselves from the chief stock of the nation, and settle in different districts. This supposition is more in harmony with several passages of the Pentateuch (as Exod. iii. 1, iv. 27, xviii. 1; Numb. x. 29; see *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. ii. 94).—Wells are of such vital importance for the nomadic tribes of the East, in the arid tracts which they inhabit, that they are not seldom the cause of serious contention and even warfare (Gen. xxvi. 15, 20; *Paxton*, Illustr. i. pp. 41—50); and in the Bible they are frequently the scene of the narrative. The water was fetched at fixed times of the day (see Odyssey vii. 20; *Rosenmüller*, Orient. i. p. 102), and Niebuhr found in those regions still the same obliging politeness (Travels, ii. p. 410). Wells and fountains were places of amusement and of social meetings, and frequently engagements were here concluded; thus the matrimonial alliances of Isaac, Jacob and Moses, were formed at wells (Gen. xxiv. xxix).—*And he sat down by* the *well* (הבאר). The definite article, which appears strange, is accounted for by Ewald (Gram. § 496), "because there is, in the neighbourhood of each town, one well only for watering the cattle." "Perhaps that well bore the name of 'the well of Midian'" (*Glaire*).

וַתְּמַלֶּאנָה אֶת־הָרְהָטִים לְהַשְׁקוֹת צֹאן אֲבִיהֶן׃ 17 וַיָּבֹאוּ
הָרֹעִים וַיְגָרְשׁוּם וַיָּקָם מֹשֶׁה וַיּוֹשִׁעָן וַיַּשְׁקְ אֶת־צֹאנָם׃
18 וַתָּבֹאנָה אֶל־רְעוּאֵל אֲבִיהֶן וַיֹּאמֶר מַדּוּעַ מִהַרְתֶּן בֹּא

16. *Now the priest* (ולכהן) *of Midian.* Onkelos: רבא, the chief of the Midianites, so Rashi; Jonathan: אונס, tyrant. But the sons of David are also called כהנים (2 Sam. viii. 18), which, it is asserted, cannot mean *priests*, as these were only the descendants of Aaron (Numb. iii. 10), but civil officers; in which opinion they are the more strengthened by the parallel passage in 1 Chron. xviii. 17, where the sons of David are called "the first about the person of the king." But as David himself certainly offered sacrifices, and blessed the people (2 Sam. vi. 17, 18; xxiv. 25), which are, undoubtedly, sacerdotal functions, he could as well confer upon his sons some of these ministrations. We, therefore, rather accede to Ebn Ezra's opinion, that every minister, even one of an idolatrous religion, is called *priest* (כהן). In Exod. xviii. 12, pontifical functions are ascribed to Jethro. כהן is synonymous with משרת, public servant or officer, and might signify either a civil or clerical dignitary, or both at the same time; for it is well known that the functions of sovereign and priest were, in ancient polities, united in the same person; see *Ebn Ezra* on Gen. xli. 45; *Salomon*, on our verse, and *Gesenius*, in the preface to the German edition of his Hebrew Dictionary, ed. ii. p. 37. The Septuagint adds, after "seven daughters," the words, "feeding the flock of *his* father Jethro," (τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰοθόρ, see note to ver. 18). רהטים *watering troughs*, gutters (canales pastorii, Gen. xxx. 38, 41); Chaldaic רהטיא, from the rare root רהט, akin with רוץ, to run, to flow. ותדלנה, from the root דלה, originally, *to hang down* (like دلى V. in Arabic), then transitively, *to let down*, viz., a pail or bucket into a well, to draw water.

17. ויגרשום, instead of ויגרשון, because the latter might be confounded with the simple second person plural and Nun paragogicum; therefore, the forms terminating in ו and י do not take ן as the suffix of the third person plural fem., but generally ם without difference of the gender (compare Gen. xxvi. 18; Josh. iv. 8; 1 Sam. vi. 10); see *Gesen.* Lehrg. p. 210; *Ewald*, § 327, 1, and *Ebn Ezra*, on this verse.—צאנם, instead of צאנן, see our note to i. 21.—The reason of the strife is thus described by Josephus (Antiq. II. xi. 2); "There being a scarcity of water in those regions, the shepherds exerted themselves to be the first in occupying the wells, lest others use up the water and their own cattle be unprovided for." — *And helped them.* This is the second time that we see Moses assist the feeble and injured (Cahen).

18. The chief difficulty of this verse lies in the name *Reuel* (רעואל), which is here attributed to the father-in-law of Moses, whilst in iii. 1, 4, 18, he is called *Jethro* (יתרו and יתר); and in Numb. x. 29, *Hobab the son of Reuel* (חבב בן־רעואל), which latter designation agrees with Judges iv. 11, so that Reuel would be the grandfather and not the father of the seven daughters mentioned in our text. Although *father* (אב) is sometimes used in a general sense for ancestor (Gen. xxxii. 10; Dan. v. 2), and *son* (בן), and *daughter*, (בת) in that of grandchild (Gen. xxix. 5; 2 Sam. xix. 25), yet the distinct repetition of *their father*, *his daughters*, etc. (אביהן, בנותיו, בתו) excludes, in our passage, that conception, which is adopted by Targum Jonathan, Ebn Ezra, Rashbam, Mendelssohn, and Rosenmüller. Abarbanel leaves the question undecided. Nor is this view sufficiently corroborated by the remark of Michaelis, that Reuel, the

16. Now the priest of Midian had seven daughters: and
they came and drew *water*, and filled the gutters to water
their father's flock. 17. And the shepherds came and
drove them away: but Moses arose and helped them, and
watered their flock. 18. And when they came to Reuel,
their father, he said, How *is it that* you are come so soon

grandfather, was still alive, and was, therefore, the head of the family, when Moses first arrived in Midian, but that, after his death, that dignity passed over to Jethro, his son, who is, therefore, from the next chapter, exclusively mentioned (for between our verse, and the beginning of the third chapter, lies a long interval of time, ver. 23) But Jethro would then, according to the context (ver. 21), be the brother, and not the father of Zipporah. To explain this difficulty, some critics have advanced, that חתן (like the Arabic ختن) has a wider signification than father-in-law, including all the relatives on the side of the wife. But this meaning of חתן is, with certainty, not found in any passage of the Bible. Vater suggests, that Reuel is a mere appellation, "friend of God" (רעו אל), or an official title; and Clericus asserts the same of Jethro (from יתר, dignity, see Gen. xlix. 3; *Ewald*, Hist. of Israel ii. p. 14=כהן, who conjectures also, that "by a very ancient mistake יתרו בן has been omitted before רעואל"): but these are nothing more than convenient suppositions, although those of Clericus and Vater are strengthened by Josephus (Antiq. II. xii. 1: *τοῦτο γάρ*—Ἰεθεγλαῖος, which is, no doubt, identical with Ἰεθραῖος—ἦν ἐπίκλημα τῷ Ῥαγουήλῳ). Eichhorn removes the difficulty very unceremoniously, by his dissecting and anatomising theory, asserting, that the first two chapters of Exodus have a different author from the following part of the book, and that the one calls Moses' father-in-law Reuel, the other Jethro; by which explanation, however, hazarded in itself, the third name חבב, is not accounted for, unless, indeed, he suppose a third author, and a third fragment, which is actually done in the English commentary of Wilson (1853), with the following words: "Three different writers gave varying accounts, and the compiler of the Pentateuch [according to that author, Ezra, B. C. 500] implicitly followed his original documents," because "not any single writer would throw such uncertainty about his subject." Nor would even the most heedless compiler, much less the wise Ezra, have given such confused statements; for is a *compiler* less bound to regard the unity and harmony of his work than the author of original documents? Such theories are convenient, but not scientific. Cahen throws out the remark: "Moses had, perhaps, several fathers-in-law," without in any way substantiating this opinion. But we need only recur to the observation of the Talmud, that Moses' father-in-law had seven different names, among which are mentioned Reuel, Hobab and Jethro. (These three words have a similar signification,—the beloved of God; see *Lengerke*, Kenaan, i. 393; *Bertheau*, Hist. of Isr. p. 242). Nor is it unusual in the East for the same person to have more than one name; so, for instance, is Jacob identical with Israel, and Israel with Jeshurun; Esau bore also the name of Edom; David called the son of Bathsheba Solomon (שלמה), whilst the prophet Nathan called him Jedidiah (ידידיה, 2 Sam. xii. 24, 25. Compare also 1 Sam. xiv. 49, and xxxi. 2; 2 Sam. iii. 2, and 1 Chron. iii. 1). For the names were not unfrequently, at eventful circumstances in the lives of individuals, altered in accordance with the character of those facts (שנוי השם). So were the names of Abram and Sarai changed into Abraham and

הַיּוֹם׃ 19 וַתֹּאמַרְןָ אִישׁ מִצְרִי הִצִּילָנוּ מִיַּד הָרֹעִים וְגַם־דָּלֹה
דָלָה לָנוּ וַיַּשְׁקְ אֶת־הַצֹּאן׃ 20 וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־בְּנֹתָיו וְאַיּוֹ לָמָּה
זֶּה עֲזַבְתֶּן אֶת־הָאִישׁ קִרְאֶן לוֹ וְיֹאכַל לָחֶם׃ 21 וַיּוֹאֶל
מֹשֶׁה לָשֶׁבֶת אֶת־הָאִישׁ וַיִּתֵּן אֶת־צִפֹּרָה בִתּוֹ לְמֹשֶׁה׃ 22 וַתֵּלֶד
בֵּן וַיִּקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמוֹ גֵּרְשֹׁם כִּי אָמַר גֵּר הָיִיתִי בְּאֶרֶץ
נָכְרִיָּה׃ פ

Sarah when a new epoch in their existence was announced to them by the deity; Hoshea was called Jehoshua (Num. xiii. 16) when he was sent to explore the land of Canaan; Gideon was called Jerubbaal after he had, by the destruction of the altar of Baal, declared open war to idolatry and idolators (Judges vi. 32, vii. 1; see 2 Kings xxiii. 34, xxiv. 17; Dan. i. 6; *Bohlen*, Gen. pp. 196, 318; compare also p. 292; see especially *Rosenmüller*, Orient. I. pp. 63—65; *Paxton*, Illustrat. i. p. 470). Sometimes the son received also the name of the father, as Tobias i. 9.—*How is it that you are come so soon?* מרוע מהרתן בא, literally, how did you hasten to come? מהר belongs to those verbs, which, (like החל and הואיל to begin; הוסיף, to continue; חדל, and כלה, to cease, etc.) are followed either by the simple infinitive—absolutus or constructus—(Deuter. ii. 25, 31; Gen. xxxvii. 5; Exod. xviii. 23), or by the Infinitive with ל (Gen. xi. 8; xxvii. 20; Deuter. iii. 24), and which have, in such connections, the force of an adverb (see *Ges.* Gram. § 139, 1; *Ewald*, Gr. § 539).

19. *An Egyptian.* Moses was considered as an Egyptian either on account of his language (Abarbanel), or his dress, or both; but certainly not on account of his physiognomy (as Cahen observes), which, being Asiatic, differed materially from that of the native and original Egyptian. (About the descent, the personal character, and the race to which the Egyptians belonged, see *Heeren*, Ideas, ii. p. 544—553).—*And also drew water for us.* The daughters of Reuel had drawn water and filled the gutters in order to water their sheep (ver. 16). The shepherds came and drove them away; but Moses filled the gutters anew, so as to be sufficient for the whole flock (ver. 17, 19; Abarbanel, Mendelssohn). "Either they magnified the services of Moses, or the water which they had drawn did not suffice" (Ebn Ezra). דָּלֹה דָלָה, the infinitive absolute, preceding the principal verb, adds emphasis to the latter: he drew water abundantly, sufficiently. See *Gesen.* Gram. § 128, 3. *a.*

20. ואיו "Where *then* is he?" ו stands thus frequently before conclusive or inferential sentences, even at the beginning, if the reason of the idea introduced with ו is contained in the preceding sentence. See *Gesen.* Dict. ו No. 5. קִרְאֶן, fem. plural of the Imperative Kal, instead of קְרֶאנָה (Ruth i. 20, קְרֶאן, ver. 19), an abbreviated form, with a short auxiliary vowel in the first syllable, like the *Imperativus energeticus* in Arabic. Similarly שמען instead of שמענה, Gen. iv. 23. See *Gesenius*, § 46. 2, note 3; *Ewald*, § 241. 1. קרא, construed with ל, as Gen. xx. 9; Levit. ix. 1; Hosea xi. 1, etc.

21. *And Moses consented.* ויואל (Hiphil of יאל), here, to *yield* to the entreaties of another, to be contented, or to consent to do something, like in Judges xvii. 11; 2 Sam. vii. 29, etc. The Septuagint does not express the verb ויואל; *Vulg.*: "Moses swore that he would dwell with him;" according to a rabbini-

to-day? 19. And they said, An Egyptian delivered us out of the hand of the shepherds, and also drew *water* enough for us, and watered the flock. 20. And he said unto his daughters, [1] Where then *is* he? why *is* it *that* you have left the man? call him that he may eat bread. 21. And Moses consented to dwell with the man: and he gave Moses Zipporah, his daughter. 22. And she bare *him* a son, and he called his name Gershom: for he said, [2] I am a stranger in a strange land.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—And where. [2] I have been.

cal tradition, that Moses promised with an oath, that he would not leave Midian without the consent of Jethro. Abarbanel infers from this verb, that Moses was, only after repeated and pressing solicitations of Reuel, and after having convinced himself of his superior wisdom, induced to stay in the house of an idolatrous priest, and to enter with him into bonds of relationship. Glaire takes ויואל here in the signification of *hazarding, venturing*, and explains, that Moses, by marrying the daughter of Reuel, exposed himself to the vengeance of the shepherds, and risked, for ever to be retained among a foreign people, and never to see again his dearly-beloved family. But, under the circumstances, no alternative was left to him, nor did his marriage in any way check his resolute plans for his return to Egypt, and the deliverance of his nation.— *With the man*, is evidently Reuel, for nobody else has been mentioned in the preceding verse; and this is a further corroboration of the opinion, that Jethro and Reuel are identical; for Jethro is incontestably the father of Zipporah, who alone could give *his daughter* to Moses (see on ver. 18). We need not, therefore, attend to the very forced supposition of Ebn Ezra, that Jethro, the father, is here not mentioned, because he happened to be absent, engaged with the performance of his clerical functions; nor can we see anything of the difficulty which Rosenmüller finds in this passage.—*Zipporah* (צפרה), a Semitic word, signifying *bird;* and so in Arabic, which was spoken in Midian (see ver. 16; عصفور, with *a prostheticum*).—It appears that the matrimonial alliance between Moses and Zipporah was concluded only a very considerable time after the arrival of the former in Midian, as, at his return to Egypt (about forty years later), his children were still of a very tender age.

22. *Gershom* (גרשם). The etymology of this name is here stated, as if it were compounded of גר (a stranger), and שם (there), wherefore the Septuagint writes Γερσάμ, whilst others believe it to be identical with גרשון (as פדיום is with פדיון) and derive it from גרש, to expel, with the formative ם (like מלכם, חירום, and פתעם = פתע). The derivation given in the text shows, unmistakably, that although Moses was, in Midian, safe against the vindictiveness and persecution of Pharaoh, and his other adversaries, and although he lived among a kindred nation, descended from Abraham, he entertained still a longing desire for that country where his brethren suffered, and that he felt deeply all the bitter pangs of an exile, although Egypt was not the land of promise, and the Israelites were then no free nation. The second son of Moses, Eliezer, was also born to him during his sojourn in Midian, which he left accompanied by his wife and *children* (iv. 20). In xviii. 3, 4, both are mentioned, and some manuscripts of the Septuagint, the Vulgate, the Arabic, Syriac and Coptic versions, introduce here also that younger son.

23. ***And it came to pass in that long***

23 וַיְהִי בַיָּמִים הָרַבִּים הָהֵם וַיָּמָת מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם וַיֵּאָנְחוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל
מִן־הָעֲבֹדָה וַיִּזְעָקוּ וַתַּעַל שַׁוְעָתָם אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים מִן־הָעֲבֹדָה׃ 24 וַיִּשְׁמַע
אֱלֹהִים אֶת־נַאֲקָתָם וַיִּזְכֹּר אֱלֹהִים אֶת־בְּרִיתוֹ אֶת־אַבְרָהָם אֶת־
יִצְחָק וְאֶת־יַעֲקֹב׃ 25 וַיַּרְא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
וַיֵּדַע אֱלֹהִים׃ ס רביעי

time, namely, in that extended period between the flight of Moses, and his return to Egypt, which embraces a space of time of about forty years (see on ver. 11, according to Ramban and Abarbanel, sixty years).—*The king of Egypt died, and the children of Israel sighed because of the bondage.* The Hebrews had, with anxious expectation, hoped for the death of the tyrant as the event which would relax their fetters, and alleviate their miseries; but his successor enacted new and still more rigorous measures of cruelty, for the deliverance from which they implored the intervention of the God of their ancestors, to whom "they now at last returned after many years of idolatrous aberration" (Ebn Ezra), and their prayers were favourably accepted by the merciful ruler of mankind. Osburn is of opinion, that the king who died, was Siphtha, the husband of Thouoris, (whom he believes to have saved and adopted Moses), and therefore, son-in-law of Sesostris the Great, who was the "new king" mentioned in i. 8, the originator of the cruel measures against the Hebrews (Mon. Hist. ii. p. 572; compare pp. 429—549). But the historical character of Sesostris entirely disagrees with the picture which the first chapter of our book draws of his conduct. Osburn himself says: "he was the greatest, the wisest, and the best king that ever sat upon the throne of Egypt" (p. 545). But the policy of the "new king" against the Israelites is both cruel and unwise in the extreme; the sanguinary edict to kill all male children, must necessarily produce a result perfectly the reverse of that which he desired, and which his interests demanded: it was not calculated to effect an amalgamation of the Israelites with the Egyptians, but their extirpation.

24. Compare Gen. xii. 7; xiii. 15; xv. 18; xvii. 8; xxiv. 7; xxvi. 3, 4.

25. *And God regarded them.* (וידע אלהים). These words, which the English Version renders: "and God had respect unto them," and which are emphatically brief, have called forth very different explanations. However, Rashi already has given the most acceptable interpretation: "he directed his mind upon them, and did not avert his eyes." The verb ידע is used in the same sense of regarding, turning the mind, in Gen. xxxix. 6; Ps. cxliv. 3; Job xxxiv. 4. The accusative of the personal pronoun (אתם) is omitted, as in ver. 3. See *Gesenius* on Isaiah i. 3; compare Ps. cxxxvii. 5. As the sense of these words is in itself unmistakable, we abstain from enumerating the various renderings which have been proposed. The translation of the Septuagint *καὶ ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς*, "and he made himself known, revealed himself, to them" seems to be based on the reading ויודע אליהם.—The expressions *and God heard, remembered, looked, regarded,* are not anthropomorphistic, but the only possible phraseology which the human language can use with reference to the Eternal Being. (Compare the excellent remarks in *Cusari* ii. 4, and our note to xix. 20, 21). The Rabbinical dictum is: דברה תורה כלשון בני אדם.

23. And it came to pass in that long time, that the
king of Egypt died: and the children of Israel sighed
because of the bondage, and they cried, and their sup-
plications came up to God because of the bondage.
24. And God heard their groaning, and God remembered
His covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob.
25. And God looked upon the children of Israel, and God
[1] regarded *them*.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Had respect unto.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE.

CHAP. II. VER. 10.

EGYPTIAN CIVILISATION AND THE LAWS OF MOSES.

We shall, in this place, only attempt the *negative* proof, that "Egyptian wisdom" could not possibly have furnished the materials for the Mosaic laws; the *positive* proof, that Mosaism is, in its sublimest and world-regenerating principles, a perfectly original system, will be established in our discussion on the individual laws.

It is true, that the Pentateuch is accurately informed on the customs and the internal organisation of Egypt. A careful comparison with the classical writers, and, still more, the examination of the monumental records of Egypt, recently pursued with such energy and promising success, proves the perfect correctness of the biblical statements concerning Egypt and her institutions. The people (except the priests), were, during a long period of Egyptian history, dependent on the king with regard to landed property (Gen. xlvii. 21—24; see our note to i. 8; compare Herod. ii. 168); the king is surrounded by a completely organised court (Gen. xii. 15), a grand vizier, who holds his seal (Gen. xli. 42), eunuchs and guards, by numerous priests, soothsayers, and interpreters of dreams (Gen. xli. 8; Exod. vii. 11); the Egyptians are correctly represented as divided into castes, who do not share their meals at the same table (Gen. xliii. 32); shepherds are an abomination to them (Gen. xlvi. 43; Exod. viii. 23); they bear burdens on their heads (Gen. xl. 16); embalm their dead (Gen. l. 2); the physical sciences were in the exclusive possession of one class ("the Chartumim" חרטמים, ἱερογραμματεῖς, Exod. vii. 8, 14); Egypt had an army always prepared for military operations (Exod. xiv. 6); Egyptian priests had to eat the animal on which the sins of the people were symbolically laden, and thus to take their transgressions upon themselves (Levit. x. 17, etc.; Herod. ii. 19). See *Spencer*, De Legibus Hebraeorum ritualibus; *Eichhorn*, Introduction to the Old Testament, iii. § 439; *Bohlen*, Genesis, Introduction, § 6. But do these coincidences compel us to suppose that the author of the Pentateuch was an Egyptian priest? or are they unaccountable except by the conjecture that Moses drew his information from the secret societies of learning? Are not all these facts such as must have spontaneously enforced themselves on every inhabitant or visitor of Egypt?

It is further to be allowed, that the Pentateuch exhibits a certain degree of civilisation in Egypt, as is partly manifest from some of the circumstances just referred to; but we must calmly estimate the extent of this culture:—

1st. The *political* organisation of the country; the system of hereditary castes, which impeded the free individual development, and brought stagnation into the national life;

the preponderance of the priests, and the impotence of the people; the tyrannical position of the king, and the yoke and contempt of the inferior, most useful classes; the dependence of the government on clerical arbitrariness; this whole organization has found but few eulogists; and it is, in almost all points, the direct antagonism of the Mosaic law, which recognises political *equality* of all citizens as the supreme leading principle (see note on xix. 22).

2nd. Egyptian *Art*, or, rather, *Architecture* (the only art in which they excelled), has called forth the loud admiration of many students and travellers; and a modern author goes even so far as to assert that "for sublime grandeur of design, and symmetrical beauty of arrangement, none of the works of Rome, of Greece, and Mesopotamia, will bear comparison with the ruins of Thebes" (*Osburn*, Monumental History of Egypt, ii. p. 176; see also *Denon*, Voyage, ii. p. 16). But it is superfluous to point out the exaggeration of such propositions; it is almost the unanimous opinion of all authorities of art, that the character of the great architectural monuments of Egypt is not beauty, but colossal and gigantic grandeur; that they were majestic piles of matter, little spiritualised by the charms of gracefulness, only calculated to inspire the mind with awe and horror, and to defy the destructive influence of time; they were seldom erected for private purposes; but they were dwellings for the Gods or abodes for the dead. *Heeren* (Ideas, ii. pp. 650—660) has proved, from the internal character of Egyptian art, "that the representation of the beautiful was not, and could not be its end;" it did not exist for its own sake; it stood in the service of religion and politics; and Osburn himself confesses, in a later part of his volume (p. 480), "Art in Egypt was altogether impatient of the trammels, not of truth merely, but of probability . . . . and this it is which goes far to deprive art in Egypt of all that can create either pleasure or interest." And thus we have the severest criticism against Egyptian art from the mouth of one of its most enthusiastic admirers (see *Rotteck*, History, i. p. 318; *Hirt*, History of Ancient Architecture, i. 1; *Tramblay*, L'Art Egyptien considéré dans toutes ses Productions. Paris, 1840; *Müller*, Arch. p. 247, etc.: *Heeren*, Ideas, pp. 526—520). The temple of Isis in Tentyris, (Denderah); the huge temple of Jupiter in Thebes; the palace and colossus of Memnon; the mausoleum of Osimandias, and all the old temples, palaces, colossi, obelisks, tombs and pyramids, which cover Egypt from Tentyris down to the islands of Elephantine and Philae; and further, the stupendous labyrinth, with its 1500 apartments beneath the earth, and as many above it, and the astounding water-works, channels, flood-gates and mounds: all this does not prove so much a remarkable advancement of the Egyptians in the laws and conditions of art, but only an extraordinary knowledge and skill in the *mechanical handicrafts* necessary for the erection of great edifices.

3rd. The "*Chartumim*" (חרטמים), no doubt the priests, were the representatives of the learning of the Egyptians. They are described as interpreters of dreams (Gen. xli. 8, 24), and performers of miracles by magical artifices (Exod. vii. 11, 22; viii. 3, 14, 15). But it is impossible to designate such knowledge with the august name of wisdom. We need only compare the different ancient translations of that word. The *Septuagint* renders *φαρμακοί* (quacks), the *Vulgate*, harioli (soothsayers), or, malefici (evil-doers), *Kimchi*, חכמי התולדות, and *Vers. Venet.* *γενεθλιαλόγοι* (experienced in nativities). And if, therefore, Moses, in consequence of his adoption by the king's daughter, was even admitted into the caste of the priests (of which the king himself was a member), and if he was even educated in all the knowledge which that caste could impart, he could not derive therefrom those elevated and sublime truths which constitute the character of Mosaism. The *astronomical knowledge* of the Egyptians, indispensable for the regulation of their agricultural labours, and the phenomena of the Nile, degenerated into *astrology*; and the science was thus converted

into a superstition (see *Herod.* ii. 82; *Diod.* i. 91, 92; *Heeren*, Ideas, ii. 636, 637). But all these are more external or secular accomplishments; we approach now the *religious* ideas of the Egyptians.

4th. Of the notion of *monotheism*, we find, in Egypt, no trace whatever. The assumption of numerous writers, therefore, that Moses learned, besides other important truths, the doctrine of Monotheism in the Egyptian mysteries, is utterly ludicrous. In general, the value of the information derived from the ancient, even Greek, mysteries, has been greatly overrated. Cicero (de Finibus, lib. i; de Legibus, lib. ii), remarks merely, that the initiated were convinced, that many deities worshipped by the nation, had originally been mortals, deified after their death; and that a future life was reserved to man. S. D. Luzzato observes: "We are justified in supposing, that the ancient mysteries, far from rejecting the pagan superstitions, were nothing but idolatrous ceremonies, which excited the contempt of such men as Alcibiades, and not a feeling of veneration, which the pure doctrine of monotheism, with its sublime truths, would have necessarily inspired." This was also the opinion of Hegel (Philosophie der Geschichte, p. 163): "In these secret assemblies (the mysteries) no pure philosophical truths were discussed, nor was, as many believe, the unity of God taught there in opposition to pagan polytheism. The mysteries were, on the contrary, ancient religious ceremonies; and it is an unhistorical and absurd conceit to seek in them profound philosophical truths." (See also Recherches historiques et critiques sur les Mystères du Paganism, par Mons. le Baron de Sainte-Croix, 2 Edit. revue et corrigée, par Mons. le Bar. Silvestre de Sacy: Paris, 1817, i. p. 440). "To trace the quadriliteral name of the God of Israel to a foreign origin, is a vain and frivolous task, a resultless toil" (*Gesen.* Thes. pp. 577, 578); that it is impossible to derive it from an Egyptian etymology has already long since been effectually proved (*Sidymi Taurinensis*, De pronunciatione Divini Nominis quatuor Literarum, Parm. 1799); the name *Jao*, which is undoubtedly identical with the tetragrammaton, was only introduced by the Gnostics about the beginning of the Christian era, but is not found on any Egyptian monument (compare notes on iii. 14; see *S. D. Luzzato*: The three Unities, in L'Educatore Israelita, No. 1).

5th. The Egyptians certainly believed in a kind of *after-life*, and even in reward and punishment in the Hades (Amenthes), in which Osiris (here called Serapis), and Isis (or Dionysius and Ceres), reigned and judged. But all these notions were conceived in a spirit of gross materialism. Herodotus (ii. 123) observes: "The Egyptians were the first who ventured to assert that the soul of man is immortal; but, if the body decays, it enters into a new-born animal; but if it had migrated through all land- and sea-animals and fowls, it passes again into a human body; and this migration is accomplished in three thousand years." And Diodorus (i. 60, 61) writes: "The Egyptians consider the period of life on earth very insignificant; but attach the highest value to a quiet life after death. They call, therefore, the dwellings of the living only temporary habitations, but the tombs of the dead are regarded as the eternal abodes . . . . . Therefore they bestow little care on the erection of their houses, whilst they lavish incredible attention and expence on the construction of their tombs." If we combine these two passages of Herodotus and Diodorus, we can understand: *a.* Why the Egyptians took such infinite pains to preserve the dead bodies by mummification, since the existence of the soul was believed to depend on that of the body; and, *b.* Why they strove to secure an undisturbed resting-place for the bodies in those huge tombs, carved, with astounding exertion and perseverance, often occupying the greatest part of their lives, out of rocks and mountains, covered with numberless paintings and inscriptions, and, most probably, often marked by colossal pyramids; since these tombs were regarded as the eternal habitations of man. From these points of view, the paramount importance ascribed by the Egyptians to

an honourable burial is explicable; and the public judgments held over the corpses, had, as their only end, to decide whether the conduct of the deceased was such as to entitle him to this privilege.—Although these notions may form the first steps towards a refined belief in immortality, it is obvious that they are, in themselves, far from revealing the internal affinity between the human soul and that eternal spirit which pervades the universe. But the doctrine of the transmigration of the soul (metempsychosis), especially in the form conceived by the Egyptians, is incompatible with every true notion of the dignity of man; it amounts, in fact, merely to the opinion, held by Pythagoras, also, of the indestructibility of matter, which changes its forms, but is never entirely annihilated. Thus the Egyptians could not impart to Moses the doctrine of immortality, which he preached from the beginning, in the history of man, who is created "in the image of God." We need, therefore, only mention, without refuting the perverse statement of Tacitus, Hist. v. 5, that the Israelites shared the Egyptian notions concerning interment, and the infernal regions, "Corpora condere quam cremare, e more Aegyptio; eademque cura et de infernis persuasio."

6th. Perhaps no people on earth has carried the abomination of *animal-worship* to such an incredible excess as the Egyptians. From the majestic denizens of the desert, and the waves, down to the harmless domestic animals, and the most diminutive insects there was scarcely any which was not, in some district of Egypt, adored with all the pomp of heathen worship, with magnificent temples, hosts of priests and endless sacrifices; and many were even, after their death, embalmed and entombed in holy sepulchres. Even Greek travellers were struck by this extraordinary species of idolatry; but Clemens Alexandrinus (Pædag. lib. ii. § 3) gives us, as an eye-witness, the following graphic description: "Among the Egyptians, the temples are surrounded with groves and consecrated pastures; they are furnished with propylaea, and their courts are encircled with an infinite number of columns; their walls glitter with foreign marbles, and paintings of the highest art; the nave is resplendent with gold, and silver, and electrum, and variegated stones from India and Ethiopia; the adytum is veiled by a curtain wrought with gold. But if you pass beyond into the remotest part of the enclosure, hastening to behold something yet more excellent, and seek for the image which dwells in the temple, a *pastophorus* (shrine-bearer), or some one else of those who minister in sacred things, with a pompous air, singing a Pæan in the Egyptian tongue, draws aside a small portion of the curtain, as if about to show us the god, and makes us burst into a loud laugh; for no god is found within, but a cat, or a crocodile, or a serpent sprung from the soil, or some such brute animal. The Egyptian deity appears—a beast rolling itself upon a purple coverlet." (Compare notes on xx. 4—6). We shall, in our remarks on the ten plagues, have occasion to dilate upon the vast and almost inconceivable extent of this superstition, and leave the reader to decide if the sublimely pure Mosaic notions of the deity can in any degree be traced to the grossest of all idolatries. We therefore omit here all reference to the human sacrifices not uncommon in Egypt (*Osburn*, Mon. Hist. ii. p. 544), and to the other rude and abject forms of divine worship, to the veneration paid to the celestial bodies, and other objects of nature, and even to the vegetable creation (Ibid. i. p. 338—348; *Meiners*, Vermischte Schriften, i. p. 204—224; *Heeren*, Ideas, ii. p. 662—667), and add merely, for our own immediate purpose, the express remarks of Manetho (Josephus c. Apion, i. 26): "Thus he (Moses) gave the Israelites laws altogether opposed to the institutions and customs of Egypt," and of Tacitus (Hist. v. 5): "The Egyptians worship most of the animals and compound images; the Jews conceive God, with the spirit alone, as one deity" (Aegyptii pleraque animalia effigiesque compositas venerantur; Judaei mente sola unumque numen intelligunt).

In this whole exposition, we have not alluded to the *time* when the Egyptians

attained to that degree of civilisation which they might have enjoyed; and an unbiassed enquiry leads us to doubt as much of the antiquity as of the extent of the learning of the Egyptians. Except the architectural monuments, many of which no doubt belong to a very remote antiquity, we have no earlier documents concerning their culture than the descriptions of *Herodotus* (about 440 B.C.), *Manetho* (270?), *Eratosthenes* (240), and *Diodorus Siculus* (about the beginning of the vulgar era), and even these authorities contain mostly but "a mixture of dry, contradictory numbers and lists of names, of miraculous stories, myths, astronomical propositions, and enigmatical allegories" (*Rotteck*, i. p. 132; see *Heeren*, Ideas, ii. 633, *et seq.*; *Jablonsky*, Pantheon Ægypt. p. 91, etc.; *Ennemoser*, Hist. of the Magi, i. 352, etc). There is, therefore, nothing that compels us to suppose that limited culture which the ancient Egyptians possessed, to have existed already at so early a period as that of Moses, who was, consequently, neither educated in the "wisdom of Egypt," nor, if this had been the case, would he have derived great and sublime truths from those sources (compare *Göthe*, Westöstlicher Divan, p. 162: "Whether Moses was protected by a princess, or educated at the court—all this had no influence upon his character and opinions.") From 1 Kings v. 10, where Solomon is said to have surpassed "all the wisdom of Egypt," or from Isaiah xix. 11, where the "wise councillors of Pharaoh" are mentioned, we can deduce no distinct conclusions concerning the degree or character of Egyptian culture; the remark of Homer (Odyssey, iv. 231), "that every Egyptian is an able physician, excelling all other men," refers only to an empirical practice of healing by means of herbs or vegetable drugs; and the observation of Josephus (contra Apion. ii. 14), that "the study of wisdom was, in Egypt, from the beginning, committed to the priests," leaves us equally doubtful as regards the nature of that philosophy, which we might, however, with some probability imagine, from its being coupled with "the worship of the gods." It is certainly not wisdom, in the sense of *philosophy*, which was only considerably more than a millennium after Moses, from Greece, transplanted to Egypt. True, Herodotus calls the Egyptians prudent and practical people (λογιώτατοι), on account of their commerce and industry; but this signifies merely their worldly shrewdness, to which they attached a high importance, so that they were almost proverbial for their cunningness and stratagems (see *Bohlen*, Ancient India, ii. 121). Even Juvenal (Satires, xv), in so late a period as the first century after Christ, does not sketch a flattering picture of the religious enlightenment of the Egyptians, when he says:—

"How Egypt, mad with superstition grown,
Makes gods of monsters, but too well is known.
'Tis mortal sin an *onion* to devour,
Each clove of *garlic* is a sacred pow'r.
Religious nation sure, and blest abodes,
Where ev'ry garden is o'er-run with gods." (*Dryden's* Translation.)

(Compare *Ovid*, Metam. v. 326, *et seq.*) Many ancient writers thought, indeed, Egyptian learning insufficient for the education of Moses, and they call in the aid of Greek, Assyrian and Chaldean preceptors—an idea as arbitrary as it is unfounded (see *Philo*, opp. ii. 84. Compare *Clem. Alex.* Strom. i. 148). Moses has, it is true, not unfrequently based his laws on institutions of the Egyptians, or other nations, whose ideas the Israelites had, by long associations, imbibed; but, whenever he does this, he infuses into the old forms a spirit of purity which changes entirely their original perverse tendency, and which converts them into most beneficial and sublime doctrines (see note on xii. 1, towards the end).

ג 1 וּמֹשֶׁה הָיָה רֹעֶה אֶת־צֹאן יִתְרוֹ חֹתְנוֹ כֹּהֵן מִדְיָן
וַיִּנְהַג אֶת־הַצֹּאן אַחַר הַמִּדְבָּר וַיָּבֹא אֶל־הַר הָאֱלֹהִים
חֹרֵבָה׃ 2 וַיֵּרָא מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה אֵלָיו בְּלַבַּת־אֵשׁ מִתּוֹךְ
הַסְּנֶה וַיַּרְא וְהִנֵּה הַסְּנֶה בֹּעֵר בָּאֵשׁ וְהַסְּנֶה אֵינֶנּוּ אֻכָּל׃

CHAPTER III.

SUMMARY.—Moses, as shepherd of his father-in-law, leads his flock to Mount Horeb; God appears to him in a burning bush; He promises to rescue the Israelites through him from the oppression of the Egyptians; and to lead them into, and to make them inherit, the land of Canaan. For this purpose God commands Moses to return to Egypt; but he hesitates. To inspire him with hope and confidence, God reveals to him His holy name, which was not yet known to his ancestors; and orders him to ask of Pharaoh only a leave of three days to worship in the desert. God in His prescience knows that Pharaoh will not consent; He is therefore determined to inflict upon Egypt fearful plagues; then only would the king allow their departure, which they would effect after having received from the Egyptians very considerable gifts in gold, silver, and raiment.

1. That *Moses pastured the flock of Jethro his father-in-law* is so natural among a nomadic tribe, whose chief wealth consists in cattle, that the opinion of Philo and many Rabbinical expounders of the sacred volume, according to whom Moses—as later David—was ordained to feed the flock as a preparation for his great mission as pastor of the people of Israel, appears as an unnecessary, though ingenious, allegorical interpretation. It must, however, be admitted, that the solemn solitude of the dreary desert materially contributed to prepare the mind of Moses for the sublime commission for which Providence had selected him, to dispose his thoughts to sacred reflection, and to mature his plans for the deliverance of his people from that thraldom which gnawed at his sympathetic heart with undiminished grief, even after a separation of nearly half a century.—About the name "Jethro," see note to ii. 18; and about "priest of Midian," to ii. 16.—*And he led his flock behind the desert.* (אחר המדבר). Although the word מדבר (derived from דבר to drive the flock, *Gesen.* Thes. i. 313) means often simply *pasture*, i.e., the place whither the flock is driven in order to feed—the מ before the root signifying the place, *Gesen.* Lehrg., p. 494—(as in Joel ii. 22; Ps. lxv. 13, etc.), it is more appropriate to understand it here in its more usual application of desert, and more properly the Arabian, Sinaitic desert.—Moses naturally led his flock from the sterile desert which the Midianites inhabited (see on ii. 15), southwards *behind the desert*, to the fertile and fruitful regions of Mount Sinai, whither the nomadic shepherds generally drive their flocks when all the other parts of the peninsula are destitute of water and of pasture.—*The mountain of God* (הר אלהים), so called by way of anticipation (prolepsis), because the glory of God appeared here at a later time to the lawgiver. Some understand הר אלהים in the sense of הררי אל (Ps. xxxvi. 7), very lofty mountains, because, according to a Hebrew idiom, everything grand and extraordinary is brought into connection with the Deity; for instance, Gen. x. 9, "He [Nimrod] was a mighty hunter before the Lord" (לפני ה׳), i.e., an exceedingly mighty hunter; Gen. xxx. 8, "combats of the Lord" (נפתולי אלהים), i.e., great, difficult combats. (See Gen. xxxv. 5; 1 Sam. xi. 7, xiv. 15; Jon. iii. 3.) But the former interpretation is preferable, and is clearly expressed by Targum Onkelos: "And he came to the mountain where the majesty of the Lord revealed itself." Josephus, blending truth and fiction, observes (Antiq. II. xii. 1): "Afterwards he drove his flocks to Mount Sinai to feed them. This is the highest mountain in these regions [which is not accu-

Chap. III. 1. And Moses kept the flock of Jethro his father-in-law, the Midianite priest, and he led the flock [1]behind the desert, and came to the mountain of God, to Horeb. 2. And an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a flame of fire out of the midst of [2]the thornbush: and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire; but the

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—To the backside of. [2] A bush.

rate], and the best for pasturage; for its herbage was excellent, and it had not been before fed upon; for as the native tribes believed that God dwelt there, the shepherds dared not to approach it."—As the Mount Horeb, by the promulgation of the law which there took place, has become of paramount importance for the history of mankind, and as the Sinaitic peninsula in which that mountain is situated forms the principal scene of the wanderings of Israel after their Exodus from Egypt, it will not be inappropriate to introduce a geographical sketch of this peninsula, with especial regard to "the mountain of God." See the supplementary note at the end of the chapter.

2. *In a flame of fire.* (בלבת אש). The word לבת has called forth the following explanations:—1. It is identical with לב, so that לבת אש means, "the heart or the centre of the fire, or the midst of it" (*Rashi, Ebn Ezra, Abulwalid*). 2. It signifies "a conflagration," derived from לבה to kindle fire; for instance, in Talm. Bab. Kam. 59. b (Kimchi). 3. It means "splendour," from להב = לבב (*Gesen.* Thes. p. 743). 4. לַבָּה is contracted from לַהֲבָה, as יקטיל from יהקטיל, or בדם from בהדם (*Gesen.* Lehrg. p. 137). 5. לבת is contracted from לַהֶבֶת, stat. constr. of לֶהָבָה *flame*, like מַכֹּלֶת from מַאֲכֹלֶת, 1 Kings v. 25 (*Ewald,* Gram. § 146; *Maurer*). The last explanation appears the most appropriate.—Thorn bush (סנה); rubus vulgaris (*Cels.* ii. 58), or rubus sanctus (*Sprengel,* History of Botany, 17), or Oxycantha arabica (hawthorn bush), which grows abundantly in the vicinity of Sinai (*Shaw,* Trav. 401; *Pococke,* Orient, i. 215). The *Septuagint* renders *βάτος*, bramble—which is, however, according to Pococke, nowhere found in those parts. See *Rosenm.* Antiq. iv. 1. p. 203—205.—בער *to burn,* here verb intransitive and active, like Judg. xv. 14; Isa. i. 31; whilst in the following verse יבער is transitive and passive, "to be burnt."—*Was not consumed.* (איננו אֻכָּל). אין, which is generally construed with the participle (as אין פותר אותם "nobody interpreted them," Gen. xli. 8), is here connected with the verb finite, which construction is of rare occurrence (Jer. xxxviii. 5; Job xxxv. 15. See *Gesen.* Lehrg. p. 830). Mendelssohn and Rosenmüller take אכל as the participle Pual, the formative מ being omitted, as in לֻקַּח instead of מלקח, 2 Kings ii. 10; in מֹרָט instead of ממרט, Ezek. xxi. 15, 16. See *Gesen.* Lehrg. p. 316; *Heidenheim,* Moda Lebinah, p. 7.—The idea that the presence of God manifests itself in the splendour of light or fire, was prevalent throughout all nations of antiquity. In Homer (Odyss. xix. 36—40), Minerva appears in a radiance of fire. The Persians adored the fire, from the belief that it enshrouds the gods. Similar notions were entertained by the Chaldeans. (See *Jamblichus,* de Mysteriis, sect. ii. cap. 4). God revealed himself in fire not only to Moses (in our text, and xix. 18; xxiv. 17), but also to Elijah (1 Kings xix. 12), Ezekiel (i. 4, 13), and Daniel (vii. 9).—Josephus thus explains our text: "The fire which surrounded the thorn bush did not injure the blossoms of the tree, nor did it destroy any of the fructiferous branches."—Some represent the whole vision related in this chapter as a dream of Moses, a conjecture destitute of every foundation; others suggest, with as little propriety, that Moses saw the setting sun behind the thicket, so

3 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אָסֻרָה־נָּא וְאֶרְאֶה אֶת־הַמַּרְאֶה הַגָּדֹל הַזֶּה
מַדּוּעַ לֹא־יִבְעַר הַסְּנֶה׃ 4 וַיַּרְא יְהוָה כִּי סָר לִרְאוֹת
וַיִּקְרָא אֵלָיו אֱלֹהִים מִתּוֹךְ הַסְּנֶה וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה מֹשֶׁה וַיֹּאמֶר
הִנֵּנִי׃ 5 וַיֹּאמֶר אַל־תִּקְרַב הֲלֹם שַׁל־נְעָלֶיךָ מֵעַל רַגְלֶיךָ
כִּי הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה עוֹמֵד עָלָיו אַדְמַת־קֹדֶשׁ הוּא׃
6 וַיֹּאמֶר אָנֹכִי אֱלֹהֵי אָבִיךָ אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק וֵאלֹהֵי

that the bush *appeared* to be in flames; others imagine an issue of phosphoretted hydrogen from a volcanic fissure!—The burning bush which is not consumed has frequently been used as a suitable allegory of the fate of Israel, which, although despised among the nations as the thornbush among the trees—oppressed, degraded, and afflicted—could never be destroyed. Abarbanel and others apply it more especially to the sufferings of Israel in Egypt, from which they came forth with enhanced vigour. The symbol of the Scotch church is likewise a burning bush, with the words beneath it: "Nec tamen consumebatur."

4. *God called unto him.* The *angel* of God, who appeared to Moses (ver. 2) is, according to our verse and the whole following relation, God himself, with a change very usual in the Holy Scriptures: the *angel* calls Abraham (Gen. xxii. 11), and it is, in fact, *God* himself (ver. 16); the *angel* of God appeared to Gideon (Judg. vi. 11), whilst he is in reality *God* (ver. 14). Similarly Gen. xxi. 17 and 19; xxxi. 11, 13, 16. Judg. xiii. 3, 22. Ebn Ezra accounts for this change in a twofold manner: 1. The angel is called God, because he is His delegated messenger; or, 2. God (יהוה) seeing that Moses was going to the bush, commanded His angel (אלהים) to call him; "for אלהים is no proper noun, but a noun appellative, implying everything divine and incorporeal." The first explanation is more acceptable; the latter, forced in itself, would not even apply to the other analogous passages. "A similar identification of the Deity with its messengers is observable in almost every apparition of angels. Originally, and especially where the primitive notions are faithfully preserved, the Deity itself descends to its favourites in a mortal shape; but gradually the emanations of its power in nature are regarded as the heralds and instruments of its decrees (Ps. civ. 4; 2 Sam. xxiv. 16), and are personified according to the manner of the Orient, as is even the case with the spirit" (רוח 1 Kings xxii. 21, *Bohlen* on Gen. xvi. 7). "Wherever God appears in the symbol of any natural phenomenon, this is His angel, or His visible agent, or, in the beautiful language of Moses: 'The name of God is in him'" (*Herder*, Geist. der Hebr. Poes. ii. p. 48).—*Moses, Moses.* The repetition of the name is intended to rouse the attention of Moses with greater force. Comp. Genes. xxii. 11. *Here am I;* an expression of willingness and ready obedience, as Gen. xxii. 11; xxxi. 11; Isa. vi. 8. Comp. Emunah Ramah ii. 6.

5. שַׁל Imperative Kal of נָשַׁל.—נַעַל from נָעַל to bind, to fasten (ὑπόδημα, σανδάλιον), a shoe or sandal (calceus; tum solea, tum calceus qui vocatur cavus" *Ges.*)—The shoes of the Orientals (as those of the Greeks and Romans) were, and are still, mere soles of leather or wood, which were fastened under the feet, and tied above them with a latchet (שרוך Gen. xix. 23). Jonathan translates therefore נעליך with *thy sandals* (סנדלך). The Egyptians were, however, famous for the sumptuousness of their sandals, which form still one of the greatest ornaments of their attire, being elaborately embroidered with flowers and

bush was not consumed. 3. And Moses said, [1]I will just
go thither and see this great sight, why the bush is not
burnt. 4. And when the Lord saw that he went thither
to see, God called to him out of the midst of the bush,
and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here *am* I. 5. And
He said, Approach not hither: put off thy shoes from thy
feet, for the place whereon thou standest *is* holy ground.
6. And He said, I *am* the God of thy [2]fathers, the God of
Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—I will now go aside. [2] Father.

other figures wrought in silk, silver and gold (*Wilkinson*, Anc. Egypt. iii. 364). Shoes are, in the East, seldom worn in the apartments in paying visits; they are usually put off in the ante-chambers (comp. *Plato*, Sympos. p. 213). To enter a place of worship with covered feet is considered as an act of the greatest irreverence. Jamieson, (in Paxton's Illustrations, i. p. 298, note), observes: "The lobby of their mosques is filled with shoes, just as the lobby of a house, or recess in a church, is filled with hats amongst us." Pythagoras also, most probably following an Egyptian custom, enjoins on his disciples to sacrifice and to enter the temple unshod. Even in the remotest antiquity it was a general custom to approach barefoot those sacred spots, where the Deity was believed to be present; thus, in our passage, and perfectly so in Josh. v. 15, where, on a similar occasion, the same command is, almost in the identical words of our verse, addressed to Joshua; and the Hebrew priests probably performed their sacred duties in the temple unshod (as is even now done by the whole people on the holiest day in the year, the day of atonement; see also 2 Sam. xv. 13, and Berach. lxii. 2). Many find in this practice a similar mark of respect and reverence as in our custom of uncovering the head; others see therein an act of cleanliness which, as the ritual emblem of internal purity, is one of the greatest virtues among the Orientals; still others consider it as a kind of pious self-castigation, just as the Roman matrons went once in procession unshod to the temple of Vesta (*Ovid*, Fast. vi. 397). The first reason is the most plausible. See *Niebuhr*, Trav. ii. p. 63, 132, Tab. 2; *Jamblichus*, Life of Pythagoras, § 89, 105; *Paxton*, Illustrat. i. p. 296—300; *Robinson*, Trav. iii. 320; *Ugolini*. Thes. xxix.—*Holy ground*. The grandeur of the scenery around the three majestic peaks of Horeb impressed from the earliest times the wandering tribes of the Arabs with awe and veneration; and the region was commonly considered as a sacred locality (see ver. 1).

6. *I am the God of thy fathers* (אביך). אב is here used collectively, like xv. 2, אלהי אבי the God of my fathers. See 2 Kings, xx. 5; Is. xxxviii. 5; 2 Chron. xxi. 12. To understand it of Abraham only, because he was the first worshipper of God among the ancestors of Moses, would be inappropriate, on account of the following words: the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, which are an explanatory apposition to אלהי אביך. Ebn Ezra remarks, that the Lord revealed Himself to Moses as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and not as the God of Levi, Kohath, and Amram, who were his nearest relatives, because the former were prophets, and the ancestors of *all* Israel.—*And Moses hid his face*. *Sept.* ἀπέστρεψε, *averted* his face. *For he was afraid to look upon God*. The verbs expressing *fear* are construed with מן (ירא מהביט); see *Gesen.* Gr. § 151, 3, c.; *Ewald*, § 543, 1). Moses

יַעֲקֹב וַיַּסְתֵּר מֹשֶׁה פָּנָיו כִּי יָרֵא מֵהַבִּיט אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים׃ 7 וַיֹּאמֶר
יְהוָה רָאֹה רָאִיתִי אֶת־עֳנִי עַמִּי אֲשֶׁר בְּמִצְרָיִם וְאֶת־צַעֲקָתָם
שָׁמַעְתִּי מִפְּנֵי נֹגְשָׂיו כִּי יָדַעְתִּי אֶת־מַכְאֹבָיו׃ 8 וָאֵרֵד
לְהַצִּילוֹ ׀ מִיַּד מִצְרַיִם וּֽלְהַעֲלֹתוֹ מִן־הָאָרֶץ הַהִוא אֶל־אֶרֶץ
טוֹבָה וּרְחָבָה אֶל־אֶרֶץ זָבַת חָלָב וּדְבָשׁ אֶל־מְקוֹם הַכְּנַעֲנִי
וְהַחִתִּי וְהָאֱמֹרִי וְהַפְּרִזִּי וְהַחִוִּי וְהַיְבוּסִי׃ 9 וְעַתָּה הִנֵּה צַעֲקַת
בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל בָּאָה אֵלָי וְגַם־רָאִיתִי אֶת־הַלַּחַץ אֲשֶׁר מִצְרַיִם
לֹחֲצִים אֹתָם׃ 10 וְעַתָּה לְכָה וְאֶשְׁלָחֲךָ אֶל־פַּרְעֹה וְהוֹצֵא
אֶת־עַמִּי בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּצְרָיִם׃ 11 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־

feared to look upon the divine apparition, which according to a very general notion nobody can behold without either losing his sight or his life (see Gen. xvi. 13; Deut. xviii. 16. Comp. *Homer*, Odys. xvi. 161). *Albo*, (Ikkarim ii. 29), assigns the reason that Moses covered his eyes, in order not to be dazzled by the splendour of the fire, and not to be diverted from the divine ideas communicated to him; for if the external senses are occupied, the reflective powers lose their energy.

7. *Indeed, I know their sorrows.* (כי ידעתי). The usual rendering: "*for* I know their sorrows," is illogical; we have therefore preferred to take כי here as a particle of protestation: *indeed* (like ver. 12), in unison with the emphatical and forcible character of the whole verse (see note to i. 19). And in giving this meaning to כי, we are enabled to take the verb ידע here in its usual meaning, *to know* (and not like ii. 25); nor need we, with Glaire and others, connect this verse with the following: "And *because* I have marked their sufferings, I am come down."

8. *And I came down to deliver them.* See Gen. ii. 5, and Raphall's note on that verse (who, however, following the explanation of Maimonides, lays too much stress on the notion of *condescending*, which is ascribed to ירד; see our note to ii. 25). Targ. Onkelos, "And I revealed myself." — A brief description of the climate, extent, and fertility of Palestine will be given on Gen. xii. 7. *Unto the place of the Canaanites and the Hittites, etc.* Although "Canaanites" is the general name for all the nations which inhabited the land of Canaan, they are not seldom enumerated as one particular tribe, or rather as a certain kind of tribes, namely probably — according to the original signification of the word כנען — the inhabitants of the *lower regions*, i. e., those tribes which lived near the coast of the Mediterranean and in the plains of the Jordan (see Gen. xiii. 7, Num. xiii. 29. Compare *Bertheau*, History of Israel, p. 161. *Ewald*, History of Israel, i. 281). Of the ten nations, the subjugation of which God promised to Abraham (Gen. xv. 19—21), six only are mentioned here, as these constituted the more important part of the population of Canaan. About the probable abodes of these tribes, see *Rosenmüller*, *Bohlen* and *Tuch*, on Gen. x. 15—19; and xv. 19—21; and *Winer*, Bibl. Dict.

9. *Now, therefore, behold*, etc. These words refer, on the one hand, back to ver. 7, which contains a similar sentence; and point, on the other hand, forward to the following verse, with which it stands in a causal connection: "Because, then, I have heard the cry of the chil-

Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God.
7. And the Lord said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people who *are* in Egypt, and have heard their cry about their taskmasters; [1]indeed, I know their sorrows.
8. And I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them out of that land into a good and large land, into a land flowing with milk and honey; into the place of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites.
9. Now, therefore, behold, the cry of the children of Israel is come to me, and I have also seen the oppression wherewith the Egyptians oppress them.
10. Come now, therefore, and I will send thee to Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my people, the children of Israel, out of Egypt.
11. And Moses said to God,

Engl. Vers.—[1] For.

dren of Israel, go to Pharaoh and lead them out of Egypt"—לחץ to press or oppress, is here construed with the double accusative.

10. *And bring thou forth my people the children of Israel out of Egypt.* It has often been asked by Biblical students, why it was necessary to lead the Israelites from Egypt, where they all had been born and brought up, and which, by their long sojourn through so many generations, they must have begun to consider as their own country; especially as their exit from Egypt exposed them to so many dangers and difficulties necessarily attendant on the march through the desert, and the military operations against warlike tribes; whilst God, if he wished to relieve them, might have inclined the heart of Pharaoh in their favour, instead of hardening it against them, and might thus have converted their abodes in Egypt into homes of happiness and comfort. The obvious answer to this question is, that the Israelites would not have been able to worship the God of their fathers, and to receive the Law, in Egypt, a country replete with idolatrous abominations; and in ver. 12 the whole aim and end of the Exodus appear to be hinted at in the words: "And this shall be a sign unto thee, that I have sent thee: when thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, *you shall serve God upon this mountain.*"

11. The best commentary on this verse is given by Josephus (Antiq. II. xii. 2), who introduces Moses uttering the following words: "I am at a loss to comprehend, how I, a man of no rank or influence, should be able to persuade my countrymen to leave a land already so long inhabited by them, and to follow me into the country to which I might lead them; or, if I even succeed to induce the Israelites to listen to my words, how can I force Pharaoh to allow them to depart, by whose services and industry his national prosperity is so materially enhanced." The diffidence of Moses, which was the result of modesty (Num. xii. 3), not of disobedience, contrasted his humble pastoral condition with the exalted position of the mighty king of Egypt and his proud courtiers, to whom, he thought, it would be impossible even to obtain access; he doubted further his capabilities, which he believed were insufficient for the difficult task, to

הָאֱלֹהִים מִי אָנֹכִי כִּי אֵלֵךְ אֶל־פַּרְעֹה וְכִי אוֹצִיא אֶת־בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּצְרָיִם׃ 12 וַיֹּאמֶר כִּי־אֶהְיֶה עִמָּךְ וְזֶה־לְּךָ הָאוֹת
כִּי אָנֹכִי שְׁלַחְתִּיךָ בְּהוֹצִיאֲךָ אֶת־הָעָם מִמִּצְרַיִם תַּעַבְדוּן אֶת־
הָאֱלֹהִים עַל הָהָר הַזֶּה׃ 13 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים
הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי בָא אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתִּי לָהֶם אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם

lead a great nation through a trackless desert into a distant country. The answer of Moses accurately corresponds with the exhortation of God in the preceding verse; "and the following verse removes in the same order the objections of Moses" (*Rashbam*). The hesitation of the lawgiver, in accepting a great and dangerous mission has several analogies in the most pious servants of God: Samuel fears the revenge of Saul, when God commands him to go into the house of Jesse to anoint David (1 Sam. xvi. 2). Jonah attempts to evade his charge to the Ninevites; and Jeremiah, when chosen by God as prophet, exclaims in an objection similar to that of Moses: "O Lord God, behold, I cannot speak, for I am but a youth" (Jerem. i. 6). However, it deserves to be remarked, that among the many doubts and objections, which Moses raised against his mission, fear for his life—the most obvious of all—is not mentioned, a sufficient proof, that not timidity to undergo danger, but want of confidence in himself, made the modest messenger doubt so despondingly and hesitatingly. And Calvin already observes, that Moses, after having slain the Egyptian, preferred a voluntary exile to a reconciliation with the tyrannical king. He left Egypt in faith (Hebr. xi. 27). The diffidence of Moses to appear before Pharaoh, not because he was banished as a murderer, but because he was but a mean shepherd, would be strange indeed, considering that he was educated at the royal court, were it not sufficiently accounted for by the circumstances, that the king, whose daughter had adopted him, lived no more (iii. 23), and that in the period of about forty years, which had elapsed since his flight, he must have become a perfect stranger to the whole royal household; so that Winer's remark with reference to our verse (Bibl. Dict. ii. p. 110): "Well might fable have been busy in adorning the history of the infancy and youth of the great legislator," is devoid of every solid basis.

12. *And this shall be a sign* (האות) *unto thee, that I have sent thee*: when thou hast brought forth, etc.—Ebn Ezra, Rashi, and Mendelssohn, suppose the sign to be the burning bush, which was miraculously preserved; just so would Moses be rescued from all the snares and persecutions of Pharaoh; so that the words: "when thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt" begin a new sentence; for the whole end of the deliverance of the Israelites was the law to be promulgated on Mount Horeb, and the covenant to be concluded between God and His people.—But this interpretation, forced in itself, would at least require the conjunction *and* before *when thou hast brought forth;* without it the sentence is extremely abrupt. Abarbanel explains: "I will be with thee; and the wonders which thou, a weak octogenarian, wilt perform, strengthened by my assistance, will be the sign that I have sent thee." But the ellipsis is too bold; besides, the following part of the verse would be liable to the same objection as the interpretation of Mendelssohn.—We have, therefore, with the authorised version, translated so, that the sign, or rather proof, is, that the Israelites will sacrifice before the Mount Sinai (the Athnach beneath שלחתיך does not preclude this conception; for it serves sometimes,

Who *am* I that I should go to Pharaoh, and that I should bring forth the children of Israel out of Egypt? 12. And He said, Certainly, I will be with thee; and this *shall be* a sign to thee, that I have sent thee: when thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, you shall serve God upon this mountain. 13. And Moses said to God, Behold, *when* I come to the children of Israel, and shall say to them, The God of your fathers has sent me to

especially in longer sentences, as a colon). Even Rashi adduces this interpretation as admissible. The Sept. translates שלחתיך with the future ἐξαποστελῶ. "The phrase *you shall serve God* is here also the symbolical, but hidden expression for the intended *revelation*" (*Philippson*; see ver. 18. iv. 23, v. 1, 3). — It might appear surprising, that God gave Moses in this case, a sign, which was fulfilled only several months after the Exodus, and which could not encourage and strengthen him for the great difficulties he had to encounter *before* its realization. But similar signs to be verified by future events were not unusual (see Isa. xxxvii. 30; 1 Sam. ii. 34); and one promise was corroborated by another assurance. Besides, by far the greatest hardships and tribulations, the severest trials and dangers, awaited Moses and the Israelites only after the legislation on Mount Sinai, during their forty years' wanderings in the solitary and dreary wilderness, in their warfare against inimical tribes, and in their multifarious troubles and privations.

13. *Behold when I come*, (בא) that is, *shall come*; the participle being used as a future, like Gen. xvii. 19. Sarah *will* bear thee a son (ילדת; see Gen. vi. 17; xix. 13. Exod. ix. 18, etc. Comp. *Gesen.* Lehrg. p. 792). — *And (if) they say to me*; ואמרו instead of ואם אמרו, as in Gen. xxxiii. 13: ודפקום instead of ואם ידפקום (see *Maurer* on Gen. xxxiii. 13. *Ewald.* Gr. § 603, 1).—Moses asked God, under what name he was to announce Him to the Israelites, or. according to Maimonides (More Nebuch. i. 63), under which attribute he should say, He had appeared to him. The name of the Deity is no matter of indifference, as it conveys in the preciseest possible form His power, His nature, and His relation to His worshippers. But the Egyptians, who, according to Herodotus (ii. 4, 50), were the most ancient nation which introduced names for their deities, advanced in this respect soon to an extreme, bestowing upon the same god a multiplicity of names, as if incapable of adequately expressing his holiness, his grandeur, and his remaining attributes, by one or a few appellations; and thus Isis was μυριώνυμος, "called by an infinite number of names," whereas the prophet Zachariah (xiv. 10), describes it as a symptom of the full and universal knowledge and the pure adoration of God: "that He will be *one* and *His name one*." If, therefore, the Israelites were to listen to the exhortation of Moses, he must necessarily address them in the service of a God, whose very name inspired confidence and awe. He must bear a name which unmistakably describes His existence and ruling Providence; for in the protracted period of their servitude and oppression, they had almost forgotten the holy name of God, under which He was known to their ancestors, and they had relapsed into the idolatries of the heathens, into Sabeanism and other superstitions; except perhaps the tribe of Levi, which is said to have invariably and faithfully preserved the true knowledge of God, which was hence designed to receive *the crown of priesthood*. Moses therefore asked God, which name, implying eternity and omnipotence, would be most calculated to arouse the Israelites at once from their lethargic indifference,

שְׁלָחַנִי אֲלֵיכֶם וְאָמְרוּ־לִי מַה־שְּׁמוֹ מָה אֹמַר אֲלֵהֶם׃
14 וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים אֶל־מֹשֶׁה אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה וַיֹּאמֶר

and to fill the degraded people with courage and confidence. Maimonides in the preface to his Commentary on the Mishna, observes: "Whenever a man came forth in Israel professing to be gifted with prophecy, the people asked first, who it was that had inspired and sent him; and if he answered, that he had his prophecy as an emanation from a star or any deity except God, they stoned him without further investigation. Therefore Moses was quite justified in asking who that Being was, who spoke to him, and in whose name he was to console, exhort, and deliver the Israelites." In the Bible, indeed, the "name of God" appears in many passages to be used synonymously with God Himself, and His internal essence (Deut. xxviii. 58. Lev. xix. 12; xxiv. 11. Isa. xxx. 27. Micah v. 3. Ps. vii. 18; xx. 2; xci. 15, etc.); and impressed with this great importance of the divine appellation, the author of the book Cusari, devotes an elaborate treatise (iv. 1. *et seq.*) to this subject.

14. *I am he who is.. "I am" has sent me to you.* אהיה..אשר אהיה אהיה שלחני אליכם. This is the name with which God orders Moses to announce Him to the Israelites, and with which the tetragrammaton (יהוה) in the following verse is identical. If we compare herewith the third verse of the sixth chapter: "And I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob with אל שדי, but under my name יהוה I was not known to them," we have a safe guide for the historical and etymological origin of the holy divine name. We shall first review the results of the modern researches on this important point, and then proceed to introduce the different interpretations, to which the obscure phrase of our text has given rise:

I. *The name* יהוה *is of genuine Hebrew derivation.*

1. It is not of *Egyptian* origin, as has so often, even in our time, been advanced (so *Gesner*: de laude dei apud Aegyptios per septem vocales—*ιηωουα*—in Com. Goetting, i. p. 245). This supposition, based on a wrong conception of Eusebius, has been successfully and ably refuted by Didymus Taurinensis (de pronunciatione divini nominis quatuor literarum, p. 72, *et seq.*).—The inscription, which Plutarch (on Isis, § 9) mentions to have existed in the temple of Isis in Sais: "I am all that has been, that is, and that will be, and my veil has by no mortal yet been lifted," (*ἐγώ εἰμι πᾶν τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ὂν καὶ ἐσόμενον καὶ τὸν ἐμὸν πέπλον οὐδείς πω θνητὸς ἀπεκάλυψε*), has no internal resemblance with the expression of our text אהיה אשר אהיה: "I am he who is." Isis is only the personification of nature, whose secret workings no mortal can explore; she is the parent of all existence, and to her everything that is must return — a conception common to all nations of antiquity, and not implying any pure monotheistic idea (see *Creutzer*, Mytholog. i., p. 519; ii., p. 7) Besides, the authenticity of that inscription has justly been questioned (*Mosheim* on Cudworth i. p. 399).—About the change of the name Eliakim into Jehoiakim (2 Kings xxiii. 34), see *Hengstenberg*, Christolog. iii. p. 540.—On the other hand, such passages as Exod. v. 2, where Pharaoh exclaims, "who is יהוה, that I should listen to his voice, to let the children of Israel go? I do not know יהוה," and such expressions as "the God of the Hebrews," show clearly, that even in the time of Moses, the holy name of God was either entirely or essentially unknown to the Egyptians, which fact Tacitus (Hist. v. 5) expressly testifies; see supplementary note to ii. 10, p. 41.

2. It is not of *Phoenician* origin, as Hartmann (p. 156) and many others, leaning on certain fragments of the Phoenician author, Sanchuniathon, assert. It is now generally acknowledged, that those fragments are spurious compilations

you; and if they say to me, What *is* His name? what shall I say to them? 14. And God said to Moses,

of the literary adventurer Philo Byblius, who lived between the reigns of Nero and Hadrian; and who can therefore prove nothing for so remote a time as the ante-Mosaic period (see *Meusel*, Bibl. Hist. ii. 1, p. 1, *et seq.* *Orelli*, preface to those fragments, p. 2).

3. It is only necessary to mention the absurd suppositions, that יהוה is to be traced to a *Chinese* origin (refuted by *Tholuck*, Liter. Anzeiger, 1832, p. 212 *et seq.*), or that (according to a certain oracle of Apollo Clarius, see *Macrobius* i. 18), Dionysus and the sun bore the name of Iαω (see *Jablonsky*, Pantheon, i. p. 280 *et seq.*), or that the resemblance of sound proves the original identity of יהוה and Jovis (*De Wette*, Beiträge, ii. p. 183; *v. Bohlen*, Genes. Introd. p. 102; and *Vatke*, Bibl. Theol. p. 673. See the refutation of *Hengstenberg*: Authentic. of the Pentat. i. p. 219—222).

We are, therefore, fully justified in subscribing the opinion of Gesenius (Thes. ii. p. 577): "that those labour in vain who strive to find a foreign origin to the name of יהוה;" and in asserting that the Tetragrammaton is the peculiar and exclusive designation of the God of Israel.

II. The *vowels* which are at present given to the name יהוה, do not originally belong to it, but are borrowed from אדני (with only the alteration of Sheva instead of Chateph-Pathach beneath the י); for already before the time of the Septuagint the holy name of God was, according to a tradition based on Levit. xxiv. 16, considered too majestic to be pronounced, and was, therefore, called *the name* par excellence (שם העצם or שם המיחד. See *Philo*, Life of Moses, iii. p. 579; *Josephus*, Antiq. II. xii. 4). The Talmud (Sanhedr. 90, a) enjoins: "Even he who *thinks* the name of God with its true letters, forfeits his future life;" and according to Maimonides (Jad Chasak., cap. 14, § 10), after the death of Simon the Just, the name אדני, or another appellation consisting of twelve letters, was, even in the temple, substituted for the Tetragrammaton (see Moreh Nebuch. i. 61, 62; *Theodoret*, Quæst. xiii. in Exod.; *Eusebius*, Præp. Evang. ii. p. 305); and so the true pronunciation of that name was ultimately forgotten. Jerome, Origen, Eusebius, and others mention, that in their time "the Jews wrote the name in their copies of the Bible in Samaritan characters, instead of the common Hebrew or Chaldee, in order to veil it from the profane inspection of strangers" (Pict. Bibl.); and Josephus (Antiq. III. v. 4) did not even dare to write down the Ten Commandments in the words proclaimed on Mount Sinai, but only their sense and import. The author of the speculative work *Emunah Ramah* (Abraham Ben David Halevi), in discussing the various names of God, writes (iii. 6): "But the name יהוה we are not allowed to pronounce. In its original meaning, it is conferred upon no other being, and therefore we abstain from giving any explanation of it."—Thus it follows naturally that *a*) the prefixes ב,ו,כ,ל,מ before יהוה have Pathach, not Chireck, as לַיהוה, בַּיהוה, etc.; *b*) the letters ב,ג,ד,כ,פ,ת have a Dagesh lene, if they follow immediately after יהוה, for instance, יכרת יהוה כָּל וכ׳ (Psalm xii. 4); *c*) if אדני precedes יהוה, the latter receives the vowels of אלהים, whilst the former keeps its own points. (See *H. Reland*, Decas exercitationum philologicarum de vera pronunciatione nominis Jehovah, 1707.)

III. The correct pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton, which (according to *Maimon.*, Moreh Nebuch. i. 62), was by tradition confided only to the most pious men of their respective ages, is יַהְוֶה or יַהֲוֶה, in accordance with Theodoret (Quaest xv. in Exodum i. p. 133). The Samaritans pronounce it, 'IABE, in perfect harmony with the explanation given in our text, אהיה אשר אהיה; for the י has in several verbs been changed into the kindred but harder letter ו (see *Ewald*, Gr. § 88, 223); so is הוה derived from

כֹּה תֹאמַר לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶהְיֶה שְׁלָחַנִי אֲלֵיכֶם׃ 15 וַיֹּאמֶר
עוֹד אֱלֹהִים אֶל־מֹשֶׁה כֹּה תֹאמַר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה
אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתֵיכֶם אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק וֵאלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב

חיה (Gen. iii. 20); and thus is היה identical with הוה, which form is usual in the Semitic dialects, and of which there are even in Hebrew traces, as הוה גביר לאחיך (Gen. xxvii. 29), הֱוֵא ארץ (Job xxxvii. 6). יַהְוֶה or יְהֹוָה is therefore future Kal of היה=הוה, and signifies: "He who is permanently, eternally;" for the future implies frequently the meaning of duration or prolonged existence (*Ew.* Gr. § 269), and names are not unusually derived from the future, as ישראל , יעקב , etc.

IV. Thus the holy name of God denotes the Eternal Being: He who is immutable, subject to no change through all generations. This explanation is corroborated by a variety of passages of the Old Testament. Compare Malach. iii. 6: אני יהוה לא שניתי "I am the Lord—I am immutable" (see *Philo*, De Incorrupt. Mundi, p. 950: "God is always equal and identical with himself, admitting neither of a change to a higher, nor to a lower degree;" *ἴσος γὰρ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ καὶ ὅμοιος ὁ θεὸς, μήτε ἄνεσιν πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον, μήτ' ἐπίτασιν πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον δεχόμενος*); and especially our passage where God speaks of himself in the first person אהיה; whence it follows that יהוה is the *third* person of the same verb. We may also adduce the excellent comment of Plutarch on the word EI, *Thou art*, inscribed above the door of the temple of Apollo at Delphi: "This title is not only proper, but peculiar to God; because He alone is *being*, for mortals have no participation of true being, because that which begins and ends, and is continually changing, is never *one*, nor the same, nor in the same state. The deity on whose temple this word was written was called Apollo—Ἀπόλλων—from *a negative*, and *πολύς many*, because he is *one*, his name simple, his essence uncompounded." Gesenius (Thes. ii. 577, note) proposes to take יַהְוֶה as the future *Hiphil*, signifying: "He who made exist, called into existence," the Creator; but this is no *new* attribute of the Deity (vi. 3), unknown to the patriarchs, who revered him already as the *Lord*, that is, the Creator of heaven and earth (Gen. xiv. 19, 22). We cannot see that this idea, which we have proved to be the fundamental notion of the holy name of God, is too profound or metaphysical for the simple age in which Moses lived (*Bellermann; De Wette*, Kritik, p. 182; *Bohlen*, Genes. Intr., p. 103; *Vatke*, p. 671); and the hypothesis of Koppe and others, that אהיה אשר אהיה means: "I am he whose essence is not to be described or expressed by any name;" or, "I am he who has no name," is well refuted by Hengstenberg, who remarks, that such a deity was certainly not calculated to afford much comfort and consolation to the Israelites in the severe oppression under which they then sighed. Yet Rabbi Jehudah Halevi, in his celebrated work, Cusari (iv. 3), offers a similar, as it were negative, explanation, which, however, being one of the earliest philosophical illustrations of our subject, is too interesting to be omitted here: "*Jah* (יה) is equivalent to יהוה; but אהיה is derived either from this name or from היה; by appearing to Moses under this name, God wished to preclude all subtle speculations on the true nature of His essence, the knowledge of which is unattainable; and when Moses asked: 'If the children of Israel should inquire after Thy name, what shall I say?' God answered him: 'Why should they search after something which they will eternally be unable to comprehend? (just as the angel said to Manoah: 'Why askest thou thus after my name, seeing it is secret or wondrous פלאי?' Judg. xiii. 18). Tell them only, 'I am' (אהיה), that is, 'He who is' (אשר אהיה), or the eternal God, always manifest to those who seek me." We must repeat, that however sublime

I AM THAT I AM; and He said, Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me to you. 15. And God said moreover to Moses, Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the

this interpretation of the divine name is in itself, its metaphysical ideality would have little contributed to secure for Moses any degree of enthusiasm among the Israelites, who, sunk in materialism, expected to see the power and competency of the Lord expressed in His very name. Comp. also *Chisdai*, Or Ha-schem, i. 3, c. 5. (See *Calvin* on our passage; and, on the derivation and signification of the Tetragrammaton in general, *Hengstenberg*, Authenticity of the Pentat. i. p. 204—250).

V. After having thus developed the most probable—we may almost say authentic—meaning of the words אהיה אשר אהיה, and of the name יהוה, we proceed to enumerate the opinions of the more important interpreters, as nearly as possible in a chronological order. 1. *Sept.*, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν, "I am that I am;" and just so 2. *Vulgate*, "Ego sum qui sum;" 3. *Aquila* and *Theodot.*, ἔσομαι ὃς ἔσομαι, "I shall be that I shall be," quite literally, but without distinct meaning; 4. *Onkel.* and the *Syrian* and *Persian* translators have retained the Hebrew words, אהיה אשר אהיה; 5. *Saadiah*, "I am the Eternal one, who never ceases;" 6. Targ. *Jonath.*, "He who spoke and the world was; He who spoke and the universe was." 7. Similarly Targum *Jerusalem*, "He who said to the world, Exist! and it was; and who will say to it, Exist! and it will be." 8. *Rashi*, "I shall be with them in their present Egyptian slavery, as I shall be with them in their future miseries (see Talm. Berach. 9). 9. *Maimonides* (Moreh. Nebuch. i. 63), (המחויב המציאות), "He who exists by internal necessity." 10. *Rashbam*, "I am for ever, and therefore am able to realise my promises." 11. *Abarbanel*, "I am the prime cause of existence, not created like all the other objects of the universe, therefore not depending on any body or any thing for my existence." And similarly *Albo* (Ikkarim ii. 27), "My existence depends only on myself; my will and intention are therefore certain to be executed;....no other being can say 'I am because *I* am'; but 'I am because *something else* is,' viz., the prime cause, on which the existence of all other beings depends." And so Boothroyd, "I am *because* I am, that is, self-sufficient." Vater also finds in these words, "an obscure allusion to the independence of God." This explanation, although acceptable in itself, has no necessary connection with the etymology given in our text. 12. Mendelssohn translates אהיה, "Ich bin das ewige, selbständige Wesen"; and explains: "I am, was, and shall be the king and ruler of the universe."—Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Ewald and Hengstenberg, adopt the translation: "I am that I am," implying the *eternity* and *immutability* of God. God can only be named and described through himself, however laboriously human language might strive to find an appropriate name for the Deity. The reader will find highly interesting illustrations of our verse in *Maimonides* Moreh Nebuch. i. 62, 63, which deserve attentive study.

15. The abstract designation of God is here more practically and intelligibly described by the historical addition, "God of their ancestors," who existed already in the remote ages before Abraham, and who will unchangeably exist till the last generations. Mendelssohn observes, that although there is essentially no difference between אהיה in the preceding verse, and יהוה, the former being the first, the latter the third person of the same verb: the one is pronounced as it is written; but the other is not to be spoken with its own vowels; because אהיה is the

שְׁלָחַנִי אֲלֵיכֶם זֶה־שְּׁמִי לְעֹלָם וְזֶה זִכְרִי לְדֹר דֹּר : חמישי
16 לֵךְ וְאָסַפְתָּ אֶת־זִקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי
אֲבֹתֵיכֶם נִרְאָה אֵלַי אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיַעֲקֹב לֵאמֹר פָּקֹד
פָּקַדְתִּי אֶתְכֶם וְאֶת־הֶעָשׂוּי לָכֶם בְּמִצְרָיִם : 17 וָאֹמַר אַעֲלֶה
אֶתְכֶם מֵעֳנִי מִצְרַיִם אֶל־אֶרֶץ הַכְּנַעֲנִי וְהַחִתִּי וְהָאֱמֹרִי וְהַפְּרִזִּי
וְהַחִוִּי וְהַיְבוּסִי אֶל־אֶרֶץ זָבַת חָלָב וּדְבָשׁ : 18 וְשָׁמְעוּ לְקֹלֶךָ

name by which God calls Himself, and He knows His own nature and attributes; but יהוה is the name by which men call God, and *they* cannot comprehend His essence and nature.— זכרי memorial, here used synonymously with שמי, both being correlative notions (see Isa xxvi. 8; Hos. xii. 6; Ps. xxx. 5). Sept. *μνημόσυνον*. The knowledge of God will never cease or disappear from the generations of man. לדר דר, instead of לדר ודר; the conjunction ו being often omitted in much used phrases, as תמול שלשם yesterday *and* the day before yesterday. See *Ges.* Gr. § 152, 1. a.

16. *Go and assemble the elders* (זקני) *of Israel.* It is not impossible from these words, that the Israelites had in Egypt, on the whole, a patriarchical organization in tribes, each of which stood under its chief; the tribes were again divided into families, each of which was presided over by a *Sheikh*, or זקן, who was its representative in all public matters (See Exod. vi. 14, 25; xii. 21). The families stood under the authority of the heads of their respective tribes. The *Saken*, originally the oldest member of the family, is generally more an honorary designation (not "nomen aetatis," but "nomen muneris"), like *πρεσβύτερος* in Greek, and senator or patres in Latin, and like these probably elective, not hereditary dignities (see note on v. 6). These elders might frequently, in cases of dispute, have performed the functions of *judges*, although they had no material power to give force to their decisions (see note on ii. 13); moreover, these judicial functions were not their ordinary vocation, but were only exercised besides their usual occupations and pursuits. However, that organization on the one hand, and the difference of customs, occupations, religion and language, produced an insurmountable barrier between the Egyptians and the Hebrews; and the latter formed, in the heart of Egypt, a separate state, the more ominous for the former, as the lapse of time seemed only to increase the inward antipathies, and to revive in the latter, with greater force, the old reminiscences and traditions handed down from their ancestors, and the hopes of a miraculous realization of the promises vouchsafed to them. About the *Shoterim*, see note on v. 6. Rashi explains *the elders of Israel*, "chosen and appointed a as council, for how was it possible to assemble the elders of 600,000 men?" and similarly Ebn Ezra יועצים, councillors, and Septuag., *τὴν γερουσίαν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ* "the senate of the children of Israel." But we have no account of any such council representing the whole people having existed in Egypt; and we must, therefore, assume that the chiefs of the *principal* families were assembled. The appearance of so many venerable men together with Moses was calculated to enhance, in the eyes of the king, the authority of the messenger, who thus certainly appeared as a representative of the *people*, although Pharaoh might deny him to be the delegate of the *God*, of Israel. However, we do not read in the course of the narrative, that the elders really accompanied Moses to the king (see v. 1., *et seq.*); "perhaps fear deterred them to appear before Pharaoh

God of Jacob, hath sent me to you: this *is* my name for ever, and this *is* my memorial for all generations. 16. Go, and assemble the elders of Israel, and say to them, The Lord God of your fathers appeared to me, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, saying, I have surely [1]looked upon you and upon that which is done to you in Egypt. 17. And I have said, I will bring you up out of the affliction of Egypt into the land of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, into a land flowing with milk and honey. 18. And they shall hearken to thy voice: and thou shalt come, thou and the

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Visited you and seen.

with such a bold request" (*Abarbanel*).—*I have surely looked upon you.* פקד (to take regard, to care for) is here used in the sense of "remembering with compassion or favour" (as in Gen. xxi. 1; l. 24. Exod. iv. 31. Job vii. 18), wherefore Onkelos translates: "I have certainly remembered you." This word expresses frequently the Providence of God; and His interposition in the works and destinies of man; and it is here synonymous with זכר. See Ps. viii. 5.

17. See ver. 8.

18. *And they shall hearken* (וישמעו) *to thy voice.* Although the conjunction ו has sometimes the meaning of *if* or *when* (as in ver. 13, ואמרו לי, see our note), so that these words might be translated: "and if they hearken to thy voice," as they are rendered by Saadiah, Luther, Mendelssohn, De Wette, and Arnheim; we yet prefer the easier translation of the Septuagint, the Vulgate, Targ. Onkelos, Targum Jonathan, Rashi, the English version, and others: which interpretation appears to accord better with our notions of the omniscience of God, who knows before, whether the children of Israel will listen to the words of Moses or not. Ebn Ezra explains: "And they will pay attention to the *contents* of thy words."—*The Lord God of the Hebrews hath met us* (נקרה). The same words are repeated in v. 3, where, however, the verb is written נקרא. From this circumstance, which unquestionably proves that קרא and קרה are the same verbs (for א and ה are both weak letters, and are often substituted for each other; and 2 Sam. i. 6, both verbs are indeed indiscriminately used together in the same phrase: נקרא נקריתי בהר הגלבע), some commentators, as Rosenmüller and others, following Targum Onkelos and Jonathan, have thought it right thus to interpret the words of our text: "The Lord God of the Hebrews is called upon us, i. e., we bear His name; we are His people." קרא with על is certainly used in this sense (see Deut. xxviii. 10; Jerem. xiv. 9, ושמך עלינו נקרא; Chron. vii. 14; Is. iv. 1); but this fact, which was long known to the Egyptians, could not be alleged by Moses and the elders as a reason why they wished just now to go and offer sacrifices in the desert; further קרא is, in that sense, always combined with שם; and in the mouth of the Hebrews, the phrase, "The Lord God of the Hebrews is called upon us," would be a superfluous tautology. The Septuagint (προσκέκληται ἡμᾶς); Vulgate (vocavit nos), and Luther (hat uns gerufen), who take קרה here likewise in the sense of *calling*, translate freely and ungrammatically the form נקרה in the active instead of the passive. We think it, therefore, more correct to render, *he hath met us* (with Rashi, Saadiah, the

וּבָאתָ אַתָּה וְזִקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם וַאֲמַרְתֶּם אֵלָיו
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הָעִבְרִיִּים נִקְרָה עָלֵינוּ וְעַתָּה נֵלֲכָה־נָּא דֶּרֶךְ
שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים בַּמִּדְבָּר וְנִזְבְּחָה לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ׃ 19 וַאֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי
כִּי לֹא־יִתֵּן אֶתְכֶם מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם לַהֲלֹךְ וְלֹא בְּיָד חֲזָקָה׃
20 וְשָׁלַחְתִּי אֶת־יָדִי וְהִכֵּיתִי אֶת־מִצְרַיִם בְּכֹל נִפְלְאֹתַי
אֲשֶׁר אֶעֱשֶׂה בְּקִרְבּוֹ וְאַחֲרֵי־כֵן יְשַׁלַּח אֶתְכֶם׃ 21 וְנָתַתִּי
אֶת־חֵן הָעָם־הַזֶּה בְּעֵינֵי מִצְרָיִם וְהָיָה כִּי תֵלֵכוּן לֹא תֵלְכוּ
רֵיקָם׃ 22 וְשָׁאֲלָה אִשָּׁה מִשְּׁכֶנְתָּהּ וּמִגָּרַת בֵּיתָהּ כְּלֵי־כֶסֶף

Syrian translator, Mendelssohn, Gesenius, Maurer, Ewald, Winer, De Wette, Arnheim, Cahen, and the English Version), after the analogy of ויקר אלהים (Num. xxiii. 3, 15); thus the request of the Israelites, to worship God at that particular period is perfectly accounted for; for they fear His chastisement and His wrath, if they do not execute that command (v. 3). The objection of Rosenmüller, that the elders could not say, "The Lord appeared *to us*," is of little weight; for God appeared to the whole people through Moses and Aaron.—It might be urged with surprise, that God sent Moses to Pharaoh under the pretence, that the children of Israel wished to sacrifice in the desert, whereas the real object of the journey was to leave Egypt for ever. Jewish commentators reply: God knew that Pharaoh would not grant to the Israelites even that just and moderate request (ver. 19); and that by refusing this, his obstinacy and pride would become so manifest to all, that everybody must acknowledge the judgments and punishments inflicted upon Pharaoh as just and fully merited. The king himself lost thus every justification and pretext for his refusal, as the Hebrews were not legally his slaves, and as he knew that they could, according to their religious convictions, not sacrifice to their God in Egypt (see *Abarb.* on Exod. p. 11 *b.*, 12 *b.*). Similarly observes Patterson in Brown's Bible on v. 3: "Moses makes an experiment on the feelings of the Egyptian monarch, not explaining in the first instance, the full amount of his demand, that from the mode of its reception, in its most mitigated form, he might judge of what he was to expect when he should state it in its full extent." And Ebn Ezra observes deferentially with regard to this subject (on x. 10): "We must not sceptically enquire into the works of God; for He has ordained all things with wisdom, although it is often concealed even before the eye of the wise."

19. *He will not let you go* (יתן), i. e., allow you to go, in which sense the verb נתן is also used in Gen. xx. 6; xxxi. 7. The Targumim have ישבוק.—*Even not by a mighty hand* (ולא ביד חזקה). Targ. Onkelos renders either, "he will not allow you to go, because his might is great," or more probably, "even not on account of Him, whose might is great." But more appropriate than either interpretation is that of Abarbanel, who explains: "God said, Pharaoh will not let you go, even not if *you* encounter and oppose him with all your power. Therefore, will I stretch out *my* hand and force him to obedience by my wonders," which interpretation coincides with our translation. For ו often signifies *even* (et quidem, see 1 Sam. xxviii. 3. Ps. lxviii. 10. *Gesen.* Gr. § 152, 1 a.); and ולא means therefore *even not*, which is perfectly adapted to our context; for although Pharaoh in

elders of Israel, to the king of Egypt, and you shall say to him, The Lord God of the Hebrews hath met us, and now let us go, we pray thee, a three days' journey into the wilderness, that we may sacrifice to the Lord our God. 19. And I know that the king of Egypt will not let you go, [1]even not by a mighty hand. 20. Therefore I will stretch out my hand and smite Egypt with all my wonders, which I will do in the midst thereof; and after that he will let you go. 21. And I shall give this people favour in the eyes of the Egyptians; and it will come to pass, that when you go, you will not go empty: 22. But *every*

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—"Even" omitted.

a moment of terror, after the tenth and most fearful plague, permitted the Israelites to leave Egypt, he soon repented and retracted his consent, (similarly Saadiah, English Version, Rosenmüller, Arnheim, Maurer, Baumgarten); others, (as the Septuagint, Vulgate, Luther, Mendelssohn, Vater, De Wette, Salomon, Glaire, and others,) translate: he will not let you go, *unless with a mighty hand;* but ולא has nowhere distinctly the signification of *unless* (=אם לא); the passage 1 Sam. xx. 2 is not conclusive.

21. *And I will give this people favour in the eyes of the Egyptians* (see Gen. xxxix. 21). "For in general, the Egyptians, who suffered so many plagues through Moses, might not have been very amicably disposed towards the Israelites [see, however, on i. 11]; but so great was their fear of a universal destruction, that they granted them whatever they wished, lest their departure be retarded and new miseries ensue" (*Clericus*).—About כי in the signification of *when*, see *Ewald*, Gram. § 586, 13. ריקם *empty*, adverb of ריק, as חנם of חן, the letter ם being a formative of adverbs (*Ebn Ezra*, *Mendelssohn*). Compare with the promise contained in our verse, Gen. xv. 14.

22. *But every woman shall ask of her neighbour, etc.* Very frequently this conduct on the part of the Israelites has been severely castigated, and was used for the most vehement attacks against the Israelites as committing, and their God, as sanctioning, theft, falsehood, and every abject crime (see *Irenaeus*, b. iv. c. 49; *August.* contra Faustum, b. ii. c. 71, etc.). As a specimen of the virulence with which these hostilities have been directed against the Sacred Volume, we quote the following passage from the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist (Berlin, 1786, p. 53, edited by Lessing): "If we consider the action in itself, we cannot but admit, that the whole is falsehood, deception and theft. But how, if hereunto simply the words are added: 'the Lord hath said, or commanded,' will thereby base deceit and nefarious fraud assume the character of sacred revelation? will, thereby, the most impious wickedness be converted into a pious action? Thus, it would be easy indeed to stamp falsehood as inspiration, and rancour as virtue and piety; thus we loose every test and standard of laudable and criminal deeds; thus, religion and piety differ from the most glaring villany but by a few empty words: 'God hath said it.'" However, a moderate degree of calm impartiality, and of Hebrew learning, would have prevented the outburst of this and similar effusions; and the vehemence of the accusation turns itself against the accusers themselves. The Hebrew verb שאל does not mean to *borrow* (as the Anglican Version also renders), but to *ask* or *demand* as a present. (So, among others, the Septuagint,

וּכְלֵי זָהָב וּשְׂמָלֹת וְשַׂמְתֶּם עַל־בְּנֵיכֶם וְעַל־בְּנֹתֵיכֶם וְנִצַּלְתֶּם אֶת־מִצְרָיִם׃

Vulgate, Luther, Mendelssohn, Rosenmüller, Arnheim, Hengstenberg, Lilienthal, Harenberg, Winer, Tholuck, etc.). The same verb is more than once used in this sense; for instance, in Psalm ii. 8: "*Ask of me*, and I will give nations as thy inheritance" (שאל ממני וכו'). Compare 1 Sam. viii. 10, etc. Thus, no fraud was practised against the Egyptians, who knew that they would not receive back the vessels which they gave to the departing Israelites, and who gave them willingly, *because God inclined their hearts to the Israelites* (ver. 21). Compare xi. 3, xii. 36. In this sense writes Josephus (Antiq. II. xiv, 6): "The Egyptians honoured the Hebrews with presents; some, in order to make them depart quickly, and others from affection and friendship which they felt for them as their neighbours" (Compare Psalm cxxxv. 37: "Egypt rejoiced at their departure, for their fear had fallen upon them.") Ebn Ezra endeavours to remove the reproach by the following remark: "Some inveigh against us, and say our ancestors were thieves; but these do not see that it was commanded them by God, and we have, therefore, no right to enquire into the reason, or to question the justice of that command; for God has created everything, gives wealth to whom He pleases, and takes it again from him and gives it to his neighbour, for the whole universe belongs to Him." Similarly Augustin, Pfeifer (Dub. Vex. p. 226); Calov (Bibl. Illust. ad Exod. iii. 21); Buddaeus (Hist. Eccles. V. T.) and Calvin. See, however, against this explanation, the arguments of Hengstenberg, (Authenticity of the Pentateuch, ii. p. 512). The manner in which I. D. Michaelis defends the command of God (that the Israelites *borrowed* originally goods from the Egyptians, and that they kept them as their property only when the Egyptians persecuted them, and thus broke their faith) is more specious than real, and has been ably commented upon by Hengstenberg (*loc. cit.* pp. 517, 518). Similar is the opinion of Lengerke, who, moreover, strangely brings the circumstances of our verse into connection with a certain pagan custom of the Syrians, practised on their "torch-festival," when golden and silver vessels were fixed on trees and burnt together with them. Still less to be approved of is the argument of Cahen, who observes: "It is easily explicable, that slaves, about to break their chains, did not scruple to deceive their old oppressors; such an action is excusable; it is even, as far as our knowledge of the manners of the ancient Asiatic nations goes, in perfect accordance with their notions. In order to judge with impartiality of the morals of a people, we must be acquainted with its own notions on what is just or unjust, but not criticise antiquity after the conceptions of our time." This argument might be tolerable, if the "deceit" did not originate in a command of *God*, who is the source of justice and righteousness, and the *unchangeable* standard of right in all times and all zones; if not in Him, who has commanded "Thou shalt not steal," and who cannot infringe His own laws, which are the necessary emanation of His divine attributes. *L. J. C. Justi*, in a treatise devoted to this subject, proves that the Israelites had a right to a considerable compensation for the houses, fields, and other property which they were obliged to leave behind in quitting Egypt. A similar opinion was already advanced by Abarbanel (fol. 11, *b*). "That the Israelites possessed much landed property in Egypt is more than probable," see *Lengerke*, Kenaan, p. 371. It has further been urged, that the Israelites had served the Egyptians most assiduously during several hundred years without receiving the least remuneration; for these services they could justly claim a compensation;

woman shall [1]ask of her neighbour, and of her that sojourneth in her house, articles of silver, and articles of gold, and raiment: and you shall put them upon your sons, and upon your daughters; and you shall plunder the Egyptians.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Borrow.

and as they could not hope to obtain it from their oppressors with their goodwill, they had a right to secure it by stratagem. However, not the *people*, but the *kings* of Egypt had oppressed the Israelites; the former seem even to have sympathized with their miseries; they could, therefore, justly demand indemnification only from the royal exchequer, not from the Egyptian subjects. The Talmud actually relates a law-suit of the Egyptians and the Israelites, before Alexander the Great, who, after having heard the accusation of the former, and the defence of the latter, decided in favour of the Hebrews, and even believed that the "golden vessels" were not a sufficient remuneration for the great works executed by them during the protracted period of their servitude. But we repeat, that all these devices are unnecessary if we interpret the verb שאל as *asking* or *demanding*. Winer (ii. p. 113) observes: "The Hebrew text (iii. 21) shows, clearly enough, that this command is an act of divine retaliation, a just spoliation of the oppressors. With this view we must rest satisfied, as the Biblical relations cannot be divested of their subjective points of view without being dissolved into nothing." The Hebrews asked silver and gold vessels from the Egyptians, before their departure, of which the latter were aware, and which Pharaoh had permitted. God turned the hearts of the Egyptians in their favour; they received the presents which they wished, and emigrated with their lawful property. (See also *Tertullian*, contra Marc. ii. 20; *Theodoret*, ad hunc locum; *Clemens Alexandr.* Strom. i.; *Grotius*, De Jure Belli et Pacis, b. ii, c. 7, § 2).—*And of her that sojourneth in her house.* The *Septuagint* aptly παρὰ συσκήνου αὐτῆς, which Augustin renders *concellaria*. *Onkelos*: "And of her that is near to her house," which would be tautological with the preceding "of her *neighbours*." "The Egyptians might have rented the houses which belonged to the Israelites, and the former were thus the inhabitants of the houses of the latter" (*Rosenmüller*).—*Articles of gold and articles of silver.* About the very extensive use made by the Egyptians of vessels and ornaments of precious metals, see *Rosellini*, Monum. II. ii. p. 345; *Wilkinson*, Manners, iii. 223 (for כלים are generally trinkets, as Hosea xiii. 15, כלי חמדה; Nahum ii. 10, especially Gen. xxiv. 53). Ebn Ezra finds it remarkable, that, according to our verse, the women only are to ask for those presents, whilst, in xi. 2, men as well as women are mentioned; and he answers, that the hearts of the women are more fondly attached to ornaments, as chains and bracelets. Abarbanel remarks, women, if residing in the same or a neighbouring house, have generally a more intimate intercourse with each other than men, and they asked, therefore, more universally for presents than the men.—*And you shall plunder* (ונצלתם) *the Egyptians.* נצל, in Piel, to spoil, to plunder, to take from anybody, not fraudulently and secretly, but openly and publicly, as in xii. 36; 2 Chron. xx. 25; *Septuagint*, σκυλεύσατε; *Vulgate*, spoliabitis; *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*, "You shall empty out;" similarly Luther, Mendelssohn, De Wette, Arnheim and others. The translation of Frisch and others, "And you will deliver the Egyptians, viz., from further plagues which would befall them by your longer sojourn in the land" is improbable.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE.

CHAP. III. VER. 1.

THE PENINSULA OF MOUNT SINAI.

The southern part of Arabia Petrea, which is bordered on the east by the Ælanites Sinus, or the Bay of Akabah, and on the west by the Heroopolites Sinus, or Bay of Suez (Red Sea, ים סוף), forms an almost acutely-pointed peninsula, which, if a straight line be drawn from the northernmost point of the one bay to that of the other (from Akabah to Suez), is about 70 geographical miles long, and 30 broad and is now inhabited by not more than 4,000 souls, who support themselves but scantily and with difficulty in that generally sterile and deserted region, and who in years of dearth do not even find sufficient pasture for their flocks. The northern boundary is a long chain of mountains extending almost uninterruptedly from west to east, called *El-Tyh* (Arab. *wandering*); at the northern declivity of which, towards Palestine, begins the desert of the same name, the complete name of which is, desert of the "wanderings of the children of Israel." These mountains, the northernmost of which has the distinct but synonymous name *El-Dhelel* (Arab. *straying*), are almost of equal height, and extend regularly eastward. The valleys of these mountains abound with excellent pastures, and have fine, though not numerous, fountains. They are at present inhabited by the tribes Terabeyn and Tyaha, the latter of which especially is comparatively rich in camels, flocks, and other property. At the eastern side of the peninsula, along the coast of the Bay of Akabah, numerous irregular chains of mountains, of inconsiderable height, cross each other in such confusion, that this whole tract offers the appearance of a continuous wilderness of barren rocks. The western part of the peninsula is stamped with a similar character, except that it includes several larger valleys. But in the south-west there is the mount *Om Schomer*, the sides of which are intersected in all directions by a variety of mountain torrents; the surface of the bare and pointed rocks is parched by the sun; all vegetation is withered, and presents everywhere the most awful desolation and the most dreary sterility. This is "the land in which nothing is sown, the land of deserts and of pits, the land of drought, and of the shadow of death; the land that no man passed through, and where no man dwelt," to which the prophet Jeremiah alludes (ii. 2, 6. Compare Deut. i. 19, viii. 15; Num. xx. 5). "If I had to represent the end of the world," says Sir F. Henniker, "I would model it from Mount Sinai. It would seem as if Arabia Petrea had been an ocean of lava, and that, while its waves were running literally mountains high, it was commanded suddenly to stand still." And similarly writes Pringle: "The peculiar style of sublime and savage grandeur in this region, is certainly unequalled by anything I ever saw, and must, I imagine, be quite unique. It is like a sea of boiling lava, suddenly congealed, and rising in a confused chaos of abrupt and lofty pinnacles." About *Mount Serbal*, which lies north-west of Om Schomer, more on the northern part of the eastern coast of the Gulf of Suez, and which was once regarded by the pilgrims as the Sinai or Horeb of Scripture, see our note on xix. 1, 2.—The soil of this peninsula consists mostly of arid gravel (silicious earth), and produces nothing but acacias, tamarisks, and some few dwarfish shrubs. The tamarisk, one of the most common trees of that desert, yields the *Manna*, which in the month of June distils from the pores of the tree on the branches, leaves, and thorns which constantly cover the ground beneath the tree. (See note to xvi. 4). But in such parts of the peninsula as do not suffer from want of water, the soil is capable of cultivation, and can be made productive of various kinds of plants and vegetables; thus the plantations of Wadi Feiran, in the west, form an uninterrupted series of

gardens and date-groves, to an extent of four English miles. But the peninsula is not exempted from the ravages of the *Samum*, or glowing wind, which not seldom causes the most fearful devastations. The chief game there is the wild goat, called *Beden*, and the gazelle. On the eastern side there are serpents, with which the western regions also are partially infested. (See Num. xxi. 4, 6; Deut. viii. 15.)

The chain of mountains which runs southwards from the El-Tyh, reaches its greatest elevation almost in the middle of the peninsula (28° 50′ N. lat.), in a mountain, which is generally (in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers) called *Sinai*, and sometimes (in Deuteronomy and Malachi) *Horeb*, but which is unconnected with the El-Tyh, and separated from it by white, sandy plains, and various hills called Zebeir. That double name is obviously manifest from the nature of the mountain. For, rising from a common base, the rocky mass separates, at a considerable height, into two unequal peaks, the lower one, towards the north, is called Horeb, the higher one, towards the south, Sinai, which is designated by the Arabian tribes, Dshebel Musa, that is, Mount of Moses. It is, besides, probable, that *Horeb* was the name for that whole mountainous region generally, whilst the highest peak in that group was called *Sinai*. There, where both summits part, is a plain, on which stands the convent of Elijah, who, as Scripture tells us (1 Kings xix. 8), fled to Horeb from the wrath of Jezebel. According to a tradition of the Mohammedans, God revealed himself to Moses in this part of the mountain, which they call Horeb (see, however, note to xxiv. 1). In the west of either mount, and at almost equal distance from either, is the highest point of the chain, which is at present called *Mount St. Catherine*, from some legend about the body of St. Catherine being transported by angels to its summit. This whole tract, which consists of enormous granitic rocks, and is intersected and surrounded by steep valleys, is situated on the south-eastern side of the plain *Errahah*. The mount Horeb is bordered by two parallel narrow valleys, namely: 1. *Shuab*, in the east (in which stands "the convent of Mount Sinai," founded by the emperor Justinian, 527 A. C., dedicated to the transfiguration of Christ, 28¾ German miles south-east of Suez); and, 2. *El-Ledsha* in the west (in which is the convent El-Erbain, *i. e.* of the forty martyrs). The Horeb rises to a height of 1200 to 1500 feet above the plain of Errahah, whilst the elevation of Mount Sinai above the sea amounts, according to Rueppell, to 7,035 Parisian feet. The Catherine-mountain, which lies beyond the valley El-Ledsha, and is, according to the last-mentioned authority, 8,063 feet high, allows alone a free and extensive view over almost all parts of the peninsula, whilst, from the Dshebel Musa, the prospect is, in all directions, limited and obstructed. The top of the latter is a little plain of about 80 feet in diameter, on which, now, a small church stands, the chief attraction of the pious pilgrims. Although built of solid granite, it is now almost entirely dilapidated, owing to the incessant attempts of the Arabians to destroy it. About 30 feet from this chapel, on a somewhat lower plain, stands a poor little mosque, which is also held in high honour by the Moslems. It is much frequented by the Bedouins, who sacrifice here sheep in honour of Moses, offering vows to him, and imploring him to intercede with God in their favour. They celebrate a regular festival every year, for which they assemble in large numbers, and offer abundant sacrifices. The Arabians believe that the tablets of the Law are hidden under the floor of this church, and have, therefore, in the hope of finding them, instituted excavations in every direction. Burckhardt, one of the most accurate and conscientious of modern travellers, thus describes this region (ii. 971): "The upper nucleus of Sinai, composed almost entirely of granite, forms a rocky wilderness of an irregular circular shape, intersected by many narrow valleys, and from thirty to forty miles in diameter. It contains the highest mountains of the peninsula, whose shaggy and pointed peaks, and steep and shattered sides, render it clearly distinguishable from all the rest of the country in

view. It is upon this highest region of the peninsula that the fertile valleys are found which produce fruit-trees; they are principally to the west and south-west of the convent, at three or four hours' distance. Water, too, is always found in plenty in this district, on which account it is the place of refuge of all the Bedouins when the low country is parched up;" but the mountain itself is usually dry, "because no rain falls upon it, and it is, therefore, called *the mountain of dryness*" (הר חרב *Ebn Ezra*). The whole group of mountains, except the highest points of Mount Catherine, is distinguished by a luxurious fertility: at the sides of the mountains are the most superior pasture-grounds, and in the valleys grow olive—and other fruit-trees—reason enough, why Moses, in our text, led his flock just to this region so far southwards.—These

---

ד 1 וַיַּ֤עַן מֹשֶׁה֙ וַיֹּ֔אמֶר וְהֵן֙ לֹא־יַאֲמִ֣ינוּ לִ֔י וְלֹ֥א יִשְׁמְע֖וּ בְּקֹלִ֑י
כִּ֣י יֹֽאמְר֔וּ לֹֽא־נִרְאָ֥ה אֵלֶ֖יךָ יְהוָֽה׃ 2 וַיֹּ֧אמֶר אֵלָ֛יו יְהוָ֖ה

CHAPTER IV.

SUMMARY.—Moses, who fears the disbelief of the Israelites, receives from God, as a verification of his mission, three signs, which he should perform before them, and after which they would confide in him: 1. the transmutation of his staff into a serpent, and of the serpent again into the staff; 2. the leprosity and cure of his hand; and, 3. the change of water from the Nile into blood. But Moses, after having, from modesty and diffidence, to the divine dissatisfaction, repeatedly declined the high and honourable charge, is promised the assistance of his brother Aaron as his interpreter, whilst he himself, inspired by God, would dictate to him the thoughts to be impressed upon Pharaoh and the Israelites. He then asks and obtains from his father-in-law, Jethro, leave to return to Egypt with his wife Zipporah and his two children, one of whom, Eliezer, had been recently born; and after having received renewed assurances of the success of his mission, he undertakes the journey, in the course of which he is threatened with imminent danger of death, which is, however, averted by Eliezer's immediate circumcision, hitherto blameably neglected. After this accident, Zipporah, as well as her two children, returned probably to Jethro. Aaron proceeds, on the command of God, from Egypt to meet his brother, and he joined him at the Mount Horeb; both return to Egypt; they summon the elders and the people of Israel, perform the three wonders before them, and find perfect belief. The people adore and thank God for the mercy now bestowed on them, and for the redemption so reliably guaranteed to them.

1. *But, behold,* (והן) *they will not believe me.* הן is identical with הנה behold, Lat. *en*, Gr. ἥν; Septuag. ἐὰν μὴ πιστεύσωσί μοι; the Vulgate leaves הן untranslated; Saadiah renders freely, "*perhaps* they will not believe me"; all the others translate, *behold.*—This objection of Moses, which he pronounces with such peremptoriness, has its source not only in his modesty and want of self-assurance (iii. 11), but in his thorough knowledge of the character and condition of his Hebrew brethren, who, degraded and hardened by oppressive labours, and mostly alienated from the belief of their ancestors, were not likely to listen to his promises, and the cheerful hopes proclaimed to them; the less so, as the immediate effect of the measures of Moses was not an alleviation, but an aggravation of their labours. — Moses received for himself but one sign, to be realised in a *future* time (iii. 12); the people, more obdurate and disbelieving than Moses, requires two or three obvious signs for its encouragement and interest. Numerous were the idolatrous customs into which the Israelites had fallen in Egypt, and so deep roots had these abominations taken in the mass of the people, that even so late a prophet as Ezekiel felt the necessity of adverting to them with indignation. See Ezek. xx. 7, 8; xxiii. 3. Comp. Josh. xxiv. 14. *Nor hearken to my voice.* In

remarkable and deeply-interesting localities, connected as they are with the most sacred associations, have but recently been more carefully investigated by modern travellers and geographers, of whom the more important authors are: Büsching (Geography of Asia, p. 600, *et seq.*); Niebuhr (Travels, i. p. 247, *et seq.*); Volney (Travels, ii. p. 250); Burckhardt (Travels, ii. p. 872, *et seq.*); Rüppell (Abyssinia, i. p. 117, *et seq.*); Robinson (Travels, i. p. 144, *et seq.*); Wellsted (Travels, ii. p. 69, *et seq.*); St. Olin (Journal of the German Oriental Society, ii. p. 315, *et seq.*); Russegger (Travels, iii. p. 200, who has especially directed his attention to the geological character of these regions).

CHAP. IV. 1. And Moses answered and said, But, behold, they will not believe me, nor hearken to my voice: for they will say, The Lord hath not appeared to thee. 2. And the Lord said to him, What *is* that in thy

iii. 18, God assures Moses that the Israelites will listen to his voice, and that the elders will accompany him to Pharaoh, to ask his permission for their departure. But as God added, that Pharaoh would not grant their request, Moses apprehended that the Israelites might doubt his mission and reproach him: "The Lord God of our ancestors has not appeared to thee," and therefore he justly desired to be furnished with some convincing proofs of his divine charge which God readily granted him). Abarbanel reconciles our text with iii. 18, by the supposition, that the Israelites perhaps believed in the existence of an eternal and immutable being, whilst they might question the mission of Moses.

2. מזה contracted from מה־זה (which is the *Keri*), with the Dagesh forte conjunctivum in the ז (compare מלכם, Isa. iii. 15, instead of מָה לָכֶם or מַה־לָּכֶם. In these forms the Dagesh is merely euphonic.—מטה (from נטה to lean upon), *staff* (not rod, as the Engl. version has; similarly Sept. *ῥάβδος*, Vulg. Virga), upon which Moses as a man of advanced age leaned, and which he therefore constantly carried with him. It was not a shepherd's staff, because it is improbable that Moses appeared before Pharaoh as a herdsman, a class so detested in Egypt. The question of God: "what is that in thy hand?" is merely an introduction to the description of the miracle, which the following verse contains, as Rashi justly observes. According to the existing monuments, Egyptian gentlemen used generally, when walking from home, sticks from three to six feet long, either surmounted with a knob, imitating a flower, or with the more usual peg projecting from one side. One of those, which have been found at Thebes, is of cherry wood; but they were usually of acacia. Hard wood was preferred, as frequently the name of the owner was written on them (comp. Num. xvii. 2). Moreover, every Egyptian sage carried his staff (see vii. 12. Comp. *Wilkinson*, Manners iii. p. 386, 387). In the convent of Mount Sinai (see *supra* p. 63), even now the monks sell wood of a shrub (Coluthea Haleppica), which is suitable for such sticks, and is, not improbably, believed to be the wood of which the miraculous staff of Moses was made. We may add, that according to Jewish tradition, the staff of Moses was, together with nine other objects, made by God towards the close of the sixth day of the creation (see Ethics of the Fathers, v. 9). "From the story of Moses' rod, the heathens have invented the fables of the *thyrsus* of Bacchus, and the *caduceus* of Mercury" (!) observes Clarke. Here again is the Hebrew word alone sufficient

מַזֶּה בְיָדֶךָ וַיֹּאמֶר מַטֶּה׃ 3 וַיֹּאמֶר הַשְׁלִיכֵהוּ אַרְצָה וַיַּשְׁלִכֵהוּ
אַרְצָה וַיְהִי לְנָחָשׁ וַיָּנָס מֹשֶׁה מִפָּנָיו׃ 4 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה
אֶל־מֹשֶׁה שְׁלַח יָדְךָ וֶאֱחֹז בִּזְנָבוֹ וַיִּשְׁלַח יָדוֹ וַיַּחֲזֶק־בּוֹ וַיְהִי
לְמַטֶּה בְּכַפּוֹ׃ 5 לְמַעַן יַאֲמִינוּ כִּי־נִרְאָה אֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי
אֲבֹתָם אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק וֵאלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב׃ 6 וַיֹּאמֶר
יְהוָה לוֹ עוֹד הָבֵא־נָא יָדְךָ בְּחֵיקֶךָ וַיָּבֵא יָדוֹ בְּחֵיקוֹ וַיּוֹצִאָהּ
וְהִנֵּה יָדוֹ מְצֹרַעַת כַּשָּׁלֶג׃ 7 וַיֹּאמֶר הָשֵׁב יָדְךָ אֶל־חֵיקֶךָ
וַיָּשֶׁב יָדוֹ אֶל־חֵיקוֹ וַיּוֹצִאָהּ מֵחֵיקוֹ וְהִנֵּה־שָׁבָה כִּבְשָׂרוֹ׃
8 וְהָיָה אִם־לֹא יַאֲמִינוּ לָךְ וְלֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ לְקֹל הָאֹת הָרִאשׁוֹן
וְהֶאֱמִינוּ לְקֹל הָאֹת הָאַחֲרוֹן׃ 9 וְהָיָה אִם־לֹא יַאֲמִינוּ גַּם

to overthrow the artificial Mosaic-pagan conjecture, for neither the thyrsus nor the caduceus were used to *lean upon*. See note on ii. 5. There are still too many authors and critics who consider paganism as nothing but a degenerated Mosaism.

4. The ancient Egyptians were familiar with an art of taming serpents, which has been preserved to our time. Those who are practised in it keep off every attack of the serpents, which, on their command, even stretch themselves out stiff and hard like a stick. In granting this extraordinary gift to Moses, God intended to manifest, that he was thereby, by divine assistance, raised above all common magic feats. See note to vii. 12.

5. אבותם instead of אבותיהם; for the feminine substantives with suffixes have a double mark of the plural (for instance, סוסותיך); but the suffix of the *third* person plural is more usually without the second sign of the plural, as שמותם instead of שמותיהם; דורתם instead of דורתיהם; analogous herewith are forms like במותי, stat. constr. of במות.

6. *Behold, his hand was leprous as snow*, elliptically instead of, "his hand became white with leprosy, like the whiteness of snow." Onkelos translates, therefore, מצרעת with חורא white; the Septuagint omits it entirely (*καὶ ἐγενήθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ χιών*).—Leprosy, that fearful epidemic, which rages with uncommon violence in Egypt (Déscr. de l' Egypte, xiii. 159, *et seq.*), and in the south of Asia, manifests itself in four different species (*Celsus*, de Re Medic. v. 28). Our text alludes to the white leprosy, (*Barras*, λεύκη), which having once been most prevalent among the Hebrews, is called in medical phraseology *lepra Mosaica*; and in this circumstance originated the fable of several ancient and even modern historians, that the Israelites were expelled from Egypt on account of their being infested with that disease (see Introduction, § 3). We subjoin a brief description of this foul disorder, to which we shall have more than once occasion to refer in the course of our work. It begins with mealy crusts and scurfy scabs, originally not larger than a pin's point, a little depressed in the skin (Lev. xiii. 3, 30), and covered with white hairs (Lev. xiii. 3, 20). Those spots rapidly spread (Lev. xiii. 8), and produce wild flesh (xiii. 10, 14). The leprous symptoms appear most frequently on the hairy parts of the body (xiii. 29, *et seq.*); and also on members which have once been ulcerously affected (xiii. 18, *et seq.*).

hand? And he said, A [1]staff. 3. And He said, Cast it on the ground. And he cast it on the ground, and it became a serpent, and Moses fled from before it. 4. And the Lord said to Moses, Put forth thy hand, and seize it by its tail. And he put forth his hand, and caught it, and it became a staff in his hand. 5. That they may believe that the Lord God of their fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath appeared to thee. 6. And the Lord said furthermore to him, Put now thy hand into thy bosom. And he put his hand into his bosom: and when he took it out, behold, his hand *was* leprous as snow. 7. And He said, Put thy hand into thy bosom again. And he put his hand into his bosom again; and [2]took it out from his bosom; and behold, it was turned again as his *other* flesh. 8. And it will come to pass, if they will not believe thee, nor hearken to the voice of the first sign, that they will believe the voice of the latter sign. 9. And it will come

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Rod. [2] Plucked.

When the leprosy has gained ground, the whole skin appears glossy white at the forehead, nose, etc., tuberated, thickened, dry like leather, but smooth; sometimes it bursts, and ulcers become visible. The nails of the hands and feet fall off, the eyelids bend backwards, the hair covers itself with a fetid rind, or goes off entirely (Lev. xiii. 42). All external senses are weakened; the eyes lose their brightness, become very sensitive, and are constantly blearing; from the nostrils runs a fluid phlegm. In some cases the disease heals from itself, the leprous matter breaking forth suddenly and violently, and covering the patient from top to toe with white ulcerations (Lev. xiii. 12, *et seq.*). See *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. i. 115. *Michaelis*, Mos. Recht. iv. 227, *et seq.* *Murray*, Historia Lepræ. *F. Thomas*, De Lepra Graecorum et Iudæorum. *Sprengel*, Pathol. iii. 794, 855.

7. *And, behold, it was turned again as his other flesh.* This miracle was the more surprising as the white leprosy, when fully developed, is scarcely in any case perfectly curable. ("Leuce—λεύκη—quem occupavit non facile dimittit; vix unquam sanescit ac si quid ei vitio demptum est, tamen non ex toto sanus color redditur." *Celsus, loc. cit.*).

8. *If they will not believe thee.* Although God knows before, whether they will believe or not, the text intimates, that if *a part* of the Israelites should not be convinced by the first miracle, *the whole people* would believe in Moses after the second sign. And similarly explains Ebn Ezra, the first words of the following verse.—*Neither hearken to the voice* (לקול) *of the first sign*, i. e., to the voice or speech confirmed by the first sign or miracle (see Prov. xviii. 21: "life and death are in the hand—power—of the tongue)." Compare Psalm cv. 27, where Moses and Aaron are said to have performed before the Egyptians "*the words* of God's signs." Salomon and Arnheim understand erroneously: "to the *fame* or *report* of the first sign." *The latter sign* (אחרון) has here not super-

לִשְׁנֵי הָאֹתוֹת הָאֵלֶּה וְלֹא יִשְׁמְעוּן לְקֹלֶךָ וְלָקַחְתָּ מִמֵּימֵי הַיְאֹר
וְשָׁפַכְתָּ הַיַּבָּשָׁה וְהָיוּ הַמַּיִם אֲשֶׁר תִּקַּח מִן־הַיְאֹר וְהָיוּ לְדָם
בַּיַּבָּשֶׁת׃ 10 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־יְהוָה בִּי אֲדֹנָי לֹא אִישׁ

lative meaning, but is more like the second part of an antithesis, "the other or the latter," as in Gen. xxxiii. 2; Deut. xxiv. 3.

9. *Thou shalt take of the water of the river*, etc. Ebn Ezra observes: "This is a part of the first of the ten plagues which were to be inflicted upon the Egyptians." However, it was merely a *sign* to convince them of the omnipotence of the God of Israel, and of His superiority over their deities; and Rashi remarks properly: "This sign was a hint, that the Egyptians would, by the first plague, be chastised for their idolatrous veneration of the fertilizing Nile, which would be ominously converted into blood."—*And pour it on the dry land* (ושפכת היבשה). שפך being a verb of motion, governs the simple accusative. See Jonah ii, 4.—והיו המים .... והיו לדם. The same emphatical repetition of the verb היה, see in Levit. xxvii. 3; Deut. xviii. 6, etc. Josephus (Antiq. II. xii. 3) materially modifies this sign by an apparently slight alteration, for he relates: Moses saw the surface of the water assume the appearance of blood (ὁρᾷ τὴν χρόαν αἱματώδη γενομένην), whilst our text asserts that the water was *converted into blood*. The same author, however, follows the sacred text more faithfully in the delineation of the first plague, describing it thus: "The Nile flowed, at the command of God, in waves of blood, so that the Egyptians had no water to drink, possessing no other springs. Nor was the water only of the colour of blood, but those who tasted it felt great pains and bitter torments." The admirers of ingenious allegorical interpretation will find in Abarbanel different and very interesting symbolical expositions of the three signs, which he applies to Pharaoh (serpent), the children of Israel (who contaminate themselves as soon as they leave their own country), and the Egyptians (worshippers of the Nile); and happily he adapts them to the words of the text (iv. 11, 16).

10. *I pray thee* (בי) *my Lord.* The form בי is of disputed origin and signification. From a comparison of the old translations, the opinion adopted by the greater part of modern grammarians, as Gesenius, Winer, Hartmann, Maurer, etc., gains probability, that it is contracted from בעי, prayer, petition (as in Chaldee, מונא, from מוענא, burden, or בל, from בעל), so that it would well correspond with *pray!* (German, *bitte!*), as an introduction to some polite or humble request. The Septuagint generally renders in the Pentateuch, δέομαι, or δεόμεθα; the Vulgate, obsecro, or oramus; the Targumim, and the Syrian, בבעו; Saadiah, *with prayer*, or, *I pray thee.* Others consider בי as the prefix ב, and the suffix of the first person singular, so that it would be an elliptical expression signifying, "You may deal with me as you please" (*Jehudah Ha-Levi*, *Ebn Ezra*); or, "I beseech you by my name" (*Jahn*); or, "listen to me; look upon me;" or, "be favourable to me," instead of ראה בי, or רצה בי, or שמע בי. Both explanations deserve consideration; but the former has tradition and antiquity to recommend it. The rendering of the English Version, by the simple interjection O! is too indistinct.—*I am not a man of words* (איש דברים), which does not only signify "I am not an *eloquent* man" (as Mendelssohn and the English Version translate), but, also, "one to whom the enunciation of the words is difficult, owing to defects in the organs of speech," synonymous with the phrase: "of uncircumcised lips," compare vi. 12.; however, the former explanation is more rational, and seems to be confirmed by ver. 12. The Septuagint

to pass, if they will also not believe these two signs, nor hearken to thy voice, that thou shalt take of the water of the river [Nile], and pour *it* upon the dry *land*, and the water which thou takest out of the river shall become blood upon the dry *land*. 10. And Moses said to the Lord, [1]I beseech Thee, my Lord, I *am* not a man of

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—O my Lord.

translates, indistinctly: "I am not capable or fit." Clarke, contrary to the Hebrew text: "not intimately acquainted with the Hebrew tongue." According to tradition, Moses was unable to pronounce with facility the labials ף , מ , ו , ב.—The want of adjectives in the Hebrew language, has, in many instances, led to a circumlocution to replace that deficiency; thus, instead of adjectives signifying a property, quality, or habit, the corresponding substantives are used in the genitive; so, איש דברים (a man of words), an eloquent man; בן־חיל (a man of valour), a brave man; בעל החלמות (a man of dreams), a dreamer, see *Gesen.* Gram. § 104. 2. *a*; *Ewald*, Gram. § 505, *a*. גם־גם־גם (the negation, לא preceding), "neither, nor, nor," as in Judges viii. 22, in the affirmative, "reign over us, both thou, and thy son, and thy son's son." מתמול משלשם, literally, "since yesterday, or the day before yesterday." The usual form for תמול is אתמול, but whether the former is the primitive one, to which the א prostheticum has been added, or whether the latter is the original form, which has lost the א by way of *aphaeresis*, is uncertain. שלשם, derived from שלש, after the analogy of פתא and פתאם. Gesenius conjectures that it is compounded of שָׁלֹשׁ (which is identical with שָׁלֹשׁ), and יום, similar to his explanation of מחר, as a contraction from יום אָחֵר, the coming, tarrying day. This derivation appears, however, forced, although the author has lavished great sagacity and learning to defend it (*Thesaurus*, p. 784). — *Since* (מאז) *thou hast spoken.* מאז (=מן־אז) as a *preposition*, in the sense of *since*, occurs likewise in Isa. xiv. 10; Ruth ii. 7: מאז הבקר, since the morning; Psalm lxxvi. 8.—It cannot be denied, that the words of our text: "I am not a man of words, neither since yesterday, nor the day before yesterday, nor since Thou hast spoken to Thy servant," produce a strange impression, since they appear to imply a climax, the last degree of which is not without difficulties, for it seems to indicate that God spoke to Moses longer than two or three days, whilst our context affords us no ground for such supposition, although rabbinical writers believe that God conversed with Moses during seven successive days, to persuade him to accept the mission. Evidently in order to remove this difficulty, Abarbanel thus explains our verse: "I pray Thee, I am no man of words—and therefore I implored Thee to heal my defect;—but I am not only slow of speech since yesterday, or the day before yesterday, but even this very day, on which Thou hast spoken to me, and displayed before me Thy miracles; and whilst Thou hast convinced me that Thou art powerful to heal leprosy, Thou hast manifestly shown to me that Thou dost not intend to free me from the deficiency of my language, I am still 'slow of speech, and of a slow tongue,' and, therefore, send another messenger, gifted with eloquence, a quality so necessary to persuade a stubborn king, and to encourage a desponding nation." Although we admit, that this interpretation is, in some degree, artificial and complicated, it is not exactly in contradiction to the text, and is certainly the most plausible explanation of our verse hitherto proposed.—*For* (כי) *I am slow of speech, and of a slow tongue.* כי is here a *causal*, not a *disjunctive* particle (*for*, not *but*). *Slow of*

דְּבָרִים אָנֹכִי גַּם מִתְּמוֹל גַּם מִשִּׁלְשֹׁם גַּם מֵאָז דַּבֶּרְךָ אֶל־עַבְדֶּךָ
כִּי כְבַד־פֶּה וּכְבַד לָשׁוֹן אָנֹכִי׃ 11 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלָיו מִי שָׂם
פֶּה לָאָדָם אוֹ מִי־יָשׂוּם אִלֵּם אוֹ חֵרֵשׁ אוֹ פִקֵּחַ אוֹ עִוֵּר הֲלֹא
אָנֹכִי יְהוָה׃ 12 וְעַתָּה לֵךְ וְאָנֹכִי אֶהְיֶה עִם־פִּיךָ וְהוֹרֵיתִיךָ
אֲשֶׁר תְּדַבֵּר׃ 13 וַיֹּאמֶר בִּי אֲדֹנָי שְׁלַח־נָא בְּיַד־תִּשְׁלָח׃

speech (כבד פה), literally, *heavy of mouth*, or, as the ancient commentators explain: "he had too much flesh on his lips and his tongue, which made the organs of speech heavy; he is, therefore, frequently called a man of uncircumcised lips" (vi. 12). The Septuagint translates *ἰσχνόφωνος καὶ βραδύγλωσσος ἐγώ εἰμι*, which the Vulgate renders by "impeditioris et tardioris linguae sum," properly, "I am of a stammering language and a heavy tongue." Targum Onkelos "I am of heavy speech, and stammering tongue" (see *Buxtorff*, Lex. Talmud., sub יקיר, and עמיק). All these translations have a certain similarity, and are, in fact, almost identical; but we cannot find any foundation for the interpretation of others, who (like Rashbam) explain: "I am not well versed in the language of the Egyptians; I have forgotten it, for as a young man I fled from Egypt, and am now an octogenarian." The passage in Ezekiel (iii. 5), which Rashbam quotes, has no resemblance to our text, and the words, "slow of speech, and of a slow tongue," cannot possibly be understood of an individual language, but refer, in general, to the power of expression in which Moses was defficient.—It might, certainly, be asked, with propriety, why Moses, who was singled out by Providence as the great medium for bringing the wisdom of heaven down to the earth, for ever substituting divine truth instead of human error, and who was gifted with such uncommon perfection of the mind and intellect, was denied the power of eloquence, apparently so indispensable for his extraordinary vocation. But it was an act of the sublime wisdom of the Almighty to withhold from Moses just the gift of persuasion, lest it should appear that he owed the triumph over the obstinacy of Pharaoh and the disbelief of the Israelites, not to the miracles of God and the intrinsic worth of the Law, but to the artifices and subtleties of oratory, which too often procure, even to fallacies and sophisms, an ephemeral victory. It was wisely designed that the power of God should the more gloriously shine through an humble and imperfect instrument. This is a remarkable and deeply interesting difference between the legislator of Israel and the founders of almost all other religions, to whom, uniformly, no quality is ascribed in a higher degree than the gift of eloquence.

11. *Who hath made man's mouth?* which Targum Jonathan renders freely: "who hath given speech in the mouth of the first man?" The antithesis to this is: *or who maketh dumb?* A similar contrast has been found in the adjectives *seeing* (פקח) and *blind*, so that *deaf* alone seems to be without a corresponding adjective, which is accounted for by the supposition, that פקח stands in antithesis both to the preceding word חרש and the following עור. But although the verb פקח is used as well with reference to *sight* (Isaiah xlii. 7, לפקח עינים עורות) as to *hearing* (Ibid. ver. 20, פקוח אזנים), all symmetry of the antithesis would be destroyed by that supposition, and it is evident that our verse has a general emphatical or poetical character, describing God as the Creator of man, and the omnipotent Author of all his gifts and defects, which latter He is able to cure, if He thinks it expedient, and mentioning the three principal and most tender senses, that of speech, hearing and sight, by which man resembles God most, or

words, neither heretofore, nor since Thou hast spoken to Thy servant; [1]for I am slow of speech, and of a slow tongue. 11. And the Lord said to him, Who hath made man's mouth? or who maketh [2]dumb, or deaf, or seeing, or blind? [3]Do not I, the Lord? 12. Now therefore go, and I shall be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say. 13. And he said, I beseech Thee, my Lord, send, I pray Thee, by the hand *of him whom* Thou wilt

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—But. [2] *The* dumb, etc. [3] Have.

approaches to His perfection. From the same point of view the attempt of applying the qualities here enumerated to *individual* cases or persons, appears to us inadmissible, however interesting such *lusus ingenii* might in themselves be. Thus refers Abarbanel the gift of *speech* to Aaron, who was the *mouth* of his brother; the dumbness to Moses; the deafness to Pharaoh, who did not listen to the requests of God's messenger; and the blindness to the Chartumim of Egypt, who did not see the light of truth. Another less happy symbolisation of our verse is given by Rashi in a quotation from the Rabbins.—The Midrash, and "The Chronicles of Moses," relate a story of a miraculous deliverance of Moses from imminent danger of death in his infancy, when he had, by chance, in his childish play, grasped at the crown on Pharaoh's head, so that it fell down and broke into fragments. The king, considering this circumstance a fatal omen, ordered the boy to be instantly killed, when, on the advice of Jethro, in order to prove that the child was still without discernment, two basins, one filled with gold, the other with burning coals, were placed before Moses, who, by the invisible interference of an angel, did not choose the dazzling gold, for which he had already stretched out his hand, but a burning coal, with which he touched his lips; and thus he became "slow of speech, and of a slow tongue," and especially unable to pronounce the labials. "And because this defect of Moses," says Nachmanides, "was the consequence of a miracle, God did not wish to remove it."

12. *I shall be with thy mouth;* which phrase, rather obscure in itself, is, according to a frequent Hebrew idiom, more distinctly explained by a succeeding phrase connected with the former by the conjunction ו, which has, in such cases, almost the meaning of *namely*: "I shall teach thee what thou shalt say." The explanation, therefore, of Rambam, Abarbanel, and Mendelssohn, that God promised to Moses, that he would give into his mouth such words only, as would be easy for him to pronounce, is both unnecessary and trifling. The Septuagint renders: "I shall open thy mouth," which is too free and indistinct; the Vulgate has: "I shall be in thy mouth," (ego ero in ore tuo), which is still more unintelligible.

13. *Send, I pray Thee, by the hand of him whom Thou wilt send* (ביד־תשלח), an elliptical construction instead of ביד האיש ההוא אשר תשלח; whence ביד stands in the status constructus (like שפת לא ידעתי, Ps. lxxxi. 6, "The voice of a being which I do not know"). See *Gesenius*, Gram. § 121; *Ewald*, Gram. § 509.—Simple as these words are, and clear as their meaning is: "Send another messenger to Pharaoh and the Israelites, better qualified than myself," they have much engaged the ingenuity of interpreters. The nearest to the words and sense of the text is Targum Onkelos: "Send by the hand of a man, who is fit or worthy (דכשר) to be sent." More paraphrastical, and connecting a later

14 וַיִּחַר־אַף יְהוָה בְּמֹשֶׁה וַיֹּאמֶר הֲלֹא אַהֲרֹן אָחִיךָ הַלֵּוִי
יָדַעְתִּי כִּי־דַבֵּר יְדַבֵּר הוּא וְגַם הִנֵּה־הוּא יֹצֵא לִקְרָאתֶךָ
וְרָאֲךָ וְשָׂמַח בְּלִבּוֹ׃ 15 וְדִבַּרְתָּ אֵלָיו וְשַׂמְתָּ אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים בְּפִיו
וְאָנֹכִי אֶהְיֶה עִם־פִּיךָ וְעִם־פִּיהוּ וְהוֹרֵיתִי אֶתְכֶם אֵת אֲשֶׁר
תַּעֲשׂוּן׃ 16 וְדִבֶּר־הוּא לְךָ אֶל־הָעָם וְהָיָה הוּא יִהְיֶה־לְּךָ

idea with our plain words, is the allegorical rendering of Targum Jonathan: "Send this message through Phinehas [who is identical with Elijah the prophet] whom Thou wilt send at the end of all days." Less founded still in the words of our text is the explanation of Rashi: "By the hand of him, whom Thou usest to send, and this is Aaron," which interpretation leans, no doubt, besides a certain tradition, on the circumstance, that God spoke to Aaron already in Egypt before the return of Moses (ver. 27). And equally in the sphere of a free application lies the other supposition of Rashi and Ebn Ezra (which is adopted and more copiously developed by Abarbanel): "Send to Pharaoh him whom Thou wilt ultimately send to conquer and possess the land of promise"; for Moses inferred from the words of God (iii. 10), which do not include any promise to enter Canaan, that he was only destined to break the contumacy of Pharaoh, and to lead the Israelites from Egypt. "Besides, Moses felt that Aaron, who was superior to himself in age and eloquence, had a higher claim to the honour of this divine charge, and that the heart of his brother would be estranged from him if he accepted the commission" (*Ebn Ezra*). Not less objectionable are the two other explanations offered by Abarbanel, which distort still more our simple and clear text. Scarcely worthy of mention is the fancy of Troppanegger (Thes. Nov. Theol. Philol. i., p. 259, *et seq.*): "Per chirographum me ad populum tuum mittas." The modern translations express the *sense* correctly, although some of them are not free from inaccuracy in the rendering of the *words*.

14. *And the anger of the Lord glowed against Moses*, in consequence of his obstinate hesitation in accepting the glorious charge, which God intended to entrust to him. Maimonides (Moreh Neb. i. 36) observes, that the terms of wrath or anger (אף , חרון) in connection with God, are in the Scriptures exclusively used with reference to idolatry, and Moses, by evading the command of God, abetted the idolatry of the Israelites in Egypt, from which his mission was intended to free them (see our notes on xx. 4—6).—The words הלא אהרן אחיך to ידבר הוא appear to belong together, and we have therefore translated: "Do I not know thy brother Aaron the Levite, that he can speak well?" The usual translation (as that of Mendelssohn, Rosenmüller, the English Version, etc.): "Is not Aaron the Levite thy brother? I know," etc., is singularly inconsistent. The Vulgate already translates: "Aaron frater tuus Levites scio quod eloquens sit"; and the same interpretation has been adopted by Luther, De Wette, Maurer, and Glaire, and a similar one by Arnheim. It is a usual kind of *attraction* in Hebrew as well as in Latin and Greek, after the verbs signifying knowing, seeing, or perceiving, to take the *subject* of the conjunctional sentence as the objective case to these verbs; for instance ᾔσθετο τὸ Μένωνος στράτευμα, ὅτι ἤδη ἐν Κιλικίᾳ εἴη instead of ᾔσθετο τὸ.... στράτευμα.... εἶναι, "he knew that Menon's troops were already in Cilicia." (*Xenophon*, Anab. I. ii. 2.) Comp. ix. 30, ואתה ועבדיך ידעתי כי טרם תיראון מפני יי׳ אלהים "I know that thou and thy servants do not yet fear the Lord God," where אתה and עבדיך are also Nomi-

send. 14. And the anger of the Lord glowed against Moses, and He said, [1]Do I not know Aaron the Levite thy brother, that he can speak well? And also, behold, he cometh forth to meet thee: and when he seeth thee, he will be glad in his heart. 15. And thou shalt speak to him, and put [2]the words into his mouth: and I shall be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and shall teach you what you shall do. 16. And he shall speak for thee to

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Is not Aaron the Levite thy brother? I know that he, etc.
[2] Words.

natives. The infinitive before the verb finite (דבר ידבר) adds emphasis to the latter; but as the question is here about the *faculty*, not the *will* of speaking, we translate: "he *can* speak *well*." Mendelssohn renders: reden *wird;* the Sept. λαλῶν λαλήσει αὐτός σοι, he will speak *for thee*, which two latter words are added to the Hebrew text.—*Aaron*, אהרן, the shining, from אור=אהר.—הלוי *The Levite*. This word is neither used here in anticipation of the future offices of the descendants of Aaron, nor is it used to distinguish the brother of Moses from others also bearing the name Aaron; nor does it show, that it was originally intended by God to endow Aaron only with the functions of a Levite, and Moses with those of the High Priest, but that the latter forfeited this distinction by his blamable reluctance in executing the command of God; nor does it intimate that Aaron had gained great reputation in Egypt under the name of *the Levite;* all which opinions have been advanced by different ancient and modern commentators; but it indicates merely the *tribe*, to which Aaron belonged in common with Moses (as הדני is a man of the tribe of Dan), and is simply descriptive, like the preceding word, *thy brother*. A similar minute accuracy in designating a well-known individual is, for instance, found in Gen. xxii. 1: "Take thy son, thy only one, whom thou lovest, Isaac."—*And he will be glad in his heart*, that is, he will be heartily glad he will rejoice with all his heart. The Septuag. takes *heart* here as a mere pronoun, and renders ἐν ἑαυτῷ.—The fear, which might have arisen in the mind of Moses that Aaron, more fit for the honorable commission, both by his age and his distinguished fecundity, would look with envy and jealousy at the partiality displayed towards himself, this apprehension was at once dissipated by the assurance of God, which shows the modesty and moral rectitude of Aaron; "and, as a reward for these rare virtues of the heart, Aaron obtained the dignity of High Priest, and the ornament of the *breast-plate*, which is borne on the heart" (*Rashi, Abarbanel*).

15. The sense of the words, *and put the words into his mouth*, are more distinctly explained in the next verse.—*And I shall be with thy mouth.* Nachmanides makes the following sagacious, but artificial combination: "God promised Moses to direct his words before *Pharaoh*, as He undertook to assist Aaron in his addresses to the *people* (see ver. 16); but when Moses, at the close of his interlocution with God, still exclaimed: 'Behold, I am of uncircumcised lips, and how shall Pharaoh hearken to my words'? God confided the harangues before Pharaoh also to Aaron" (vii. 1). But in fact, no distinction is made in the sacred text between the appearance of Moses before Pharaoh and before the people (see iii. 10, 11).—And I shall be *with his mouth*, that the words which he—inspired by thee—will pronounce, may win the ears of his hearers, enter into their hearts, and carry conviction to their minds.

16. *And he shall speak for thee to*

לְפֶה וְאַתָּה תִּֽהְיֶה־לּוֹ לֵֽאלֹהִֽים׃ 17 וְאֶת־הַמַּטֶּה הַזֶּה תִּקַּח
בְּיָדֶךָ אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשֶׂה־בּוֹ אֶת־הָאֹתֹֽת׃ פ ששי
18 וַיֵּלֶךְ מֹשֶׁה וַיָּשָׁב ׀ אֶל־יֶתֶר חֹֽתְנוֹ וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ אֵלְכָה־נָּא
וְאָשׁוּבָה אֶל־אַחַי אֲשֶׁר־בְּמִצְרַיִם וְאֶרְאֶה הַעוֹדָם חַיִּים וַיֹּאמֶר
יִתְרוֹ לְמֹשֶׁה לֵךְ לְשָׁלֽוֹם׃ 19 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה בְּמִדְיָן לֵךְ

the people, that is, in thy stead; in which sense the preposition ל is not only used in connection with the verbs of *speaking*, as Rashi believes, but even for the conjunction of two nouns; for instance, v. 12, קש לתבן stubble *instead of* straw.—*And he shall indeed be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him instead of God.* Onkelos already, whom Rashi and Rashbam follow, expresses the sense of these words almost correctly: "He shall be to thee as an interpreter (מתורגמן), and thou shalt be to him as a teacher or master (רב)." Targum Jonathan offers the same version, but with the addition: "seeking information from the Lord." The Sept. renders the last words of our verse thus: σὺ δὲ αὐτῷ ἔσῃ τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, which the Vulgate literally translates by: "Tu autem eris ei in his quae ad Deum pertinent"—both of which translations are indistinct, concealing rather than disclosing the sense. However, the general meaning is unmistakeable: Aaron shall adorn with elegance and eloquence of expression the ideas which Moses, inspired by God, will request him to represent to the people and to Pharaoh. See especially vii. 1, *et seq.* And in this sense says Ebn Ezra: It was no derogation for Moses to be sent to Pharaoh accompanied by Aaron; on the contrary, a distinction; for Aaron resembled only the mouth, which expresses the reflections of the soul, which is invisible, like the incorporeal angels; thus Moses stood to Aaron in the category of an angel; and this is the meaning of the words: "thou shalt be to him as a God." Abarbanel is on this point also the most explicit and clear: "God said to Moses: The divine inspiration will descend upon thee without any medium or mediator, and thou shalt transfer it upon Aaron; the whole honour of the mission will therefore be thy own; and Aaron will only be like thy interpreter; compared with him, thou wilt be like a God; and he will be at thy side like a prophet, who pronounces that which God commands him.'"

17. *And this staff*, to which the Sept. freely adds: "which had been converted into a serpent," *wherewith thou shalt do the signs*, viz., which I shall command thee to do. As Moses had hitherto performed but *one* miracle with the staff, Nachmanides observes: "That when God spoke to Moses (iii. 20) of all the wonders which He would do in Egypt, He communicated them to him individually, and that He thus could here allude to *the* signs which Moses would do with the staff." They were—to convert it into a serpent before the Israelites and before Pharaoh, to smite with it the Nile, to call forth the frogs, to bring over the land the gnats, to make the hail descend, to cover the country with the locusts, and to produce darkness. From a similar reason, no doubt, the English Version does not translate the definite article in האתת, "wherewith thou shalt do signs." But the ellipsis above stated, is simple and natural; and the text stands neither in need of an alteration, nor of artificial explanations. Abarbanel finds in the staff of Moses, which God here expressly and distinctly commands him always to bear in his hand, six different symbols, very happily substantiating them with Scriptural sentences. It represents: 1. The support of, and confidence in, God; 2. The rule and sovereignty of Moses; 3. The humiliation and thraldom

the people, and he shall indeed be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him instead of God. 17. And thou shalt take this staff into thy hand, wherewith thou shalt do [1] the signs. 18. And Moses went and returned to Jethro his father-in-law, and said, Let me go, I pray thee, and return to my brethren, who *are* in Egypt, and see whether they are yet alive. And Jethro said to Moses, Go in peace. 19. And the Lord said to Moses in Midian, Go, return to Egypt, for all the men are dead

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Signs.

of the Israelites; 4. The gathering of the scattered members of the nation like a shepherd gathers his flock; 5. The chastisement to be inflicted upon the refractory and disobedient king; and 6. Justice and equity in all judicial decisions.

18 *And Moses went and returned*, from the desert, *to Jethro* (יתר) *his father-in-law.* יתר is the original form, from which יתרו is derived, instead of the more usual formation יתרון, as שלמה instead of שלמן from שלם. Similarly to יתר and יתרו we find in Jeremiah the same individual either called גשם (vi. 1, 2), or גשמו (v. 6).—*Let me return to my brethren*, that is my *family;* for he could not suppose, that all the *Israelites* had died out during his sojourn in Midian. Moses did not communicate to Jethro the real purport and aim of his departure; for if he was afraid that even his own co-religionists would not easily believe him and trust in his mission, how much less could he expect to escape the reproach of a deceived enthusiast, from one who was no direct descendant of their patriarchs, and had no knowledge of the revelations which they had received, and of the promises which they cherished as a dear and sacred pledge. Abarbanel sees in the concluding words, *go in peace*, more than a simple expression of farewell wishes; namely, a warning to take care, lest similar accidents befall him now in Egypt, as those with which he usually met when he went out to see his brethren (see ii. 11); and therefore God assured him, as the following verse relates, that all his enemies were dead.

19. *And the Lord said to Moses in Midian*, etc. As the communication here made to Moses is so important for his return to Egypt, that it might be considered as the first condition, ancient commentators believe that God must have made it to him already long since, recurring here to the often applied principle: "the chronological order of events is not strictly adhered to in the holy writ," and translating: "God *had already said to Moses.*" But we have nowhere seen that the consideration of personal danger had any influence upon the resolutions of Moses, either in his past or future conduct, or in the present communion with God (see our note on iii. 11). From the same reason the opinion of others must be rejected, who believe that Moses, even after having taken leave from his father-in-law, hesitated anew, pretending that he was afraid of the persecutions of his enemies in Egypt: on which point, therefore, God found it necessary to calm and to satisfy him. Such idea is not in the remotest sense hinted at in our text.—*For all the men are dead who sought thy life*, namely, the relatives of the Egyptian whom he killed, who had persecuted him for this deed. According to the Egyptian law, exiles were allowed to return to their homes at the death of the Pharaoh under whom they had been expelled. It has been observed above (on ii. 13), that tradition names Dathan and Abiram as "the two Hebrews contending to-

שֻׁב מִצְרָיִם כִּי־מֵתוּ כָּל־הָאֲנָשִׁים הַמְבַקְשִׁים אֶת־נַפְשֶׁךָ׃
20 וַיִּקַּח מֹשֶׁה אֶת־אִשְׁתּוֹ וְאֶת־בָּנָיו וַיַּרְכִּבֵם עַל־הַחֲמֹר וַיָּשָׁב
אַרְצָה מִצְרָיִם וַיִּקַּח מֹשֶׁה אֶת־מַטֵּה הָאֱלֹהִים בְּיָדוֹ׃ 21 וַיֹּאמֶר
יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה בְּלֶכְתְּךָ לָשׁוּב מִצְרַיְמָה רְאֵה כָּל־הַמֹּפְתִים

gether," and that these were naturally also inimical to Moses, whom they reproached with an arrogant assumption of authority; the same tradition must, therefore, include them here also among the deceased enemies of Moses; but as we find them living long after this period, recourse has been taken to the very questionable device, that they were impoverished, "and that a poor man is like to a dead one." It is sufficient to have mentioned this opinion.

20. ***And Moses took his wife and his sons*** (בניו). In ii. 22, we read only of the birth of *one* son of Moses and Zipporah, namely Gershom; and several interpreters have, therefore, considered the plural suffix in בניו, as an inaccuracy of expression as it sometimes occurs, for instance, Num. xxvi. 8, ובני פלוא אליאב; Gen. xxxvii. 35; xlvi. 7, 23. There is, however, no occasion for such conjecture, and nothing prevents us from supposing that the second son of Moses, Eliezer, was born immediately before his departure from Midian, so that he was not yet circumcised (ver. 25). — *And he made them ride upon the ass* (החמר). It is not impossible that Zipporah, with her new born child in her arms, rode together with her son Gershom on the same animal; it is, therefore, unnecessary to take here חמור as the name of the species, signifying several asses (as Gen. xxxii. 6, Sept. ἐπὶ τὰ ὑποζύγια). It is, however, not inadmissible to translate: "he made them ride each upon his ass." Some ancient commentators found it derogatory to the dignity of the Lawgiver, that his wife and children rode on an *ass*. This animal, however, is of a far superior quality in Arabia and Egypt than in the northern countries. It is livelier, quicker, more stately, courageous and robust. In Persia a good ass is often valued at a hundred pounds sterling. The Arabian ass goes considerably quicker than a camel; for whilst the former makes, in an hour, 3½ English miles, the latter goes only 2½ miles. It is very susceptible to dampness of the atmosphere; and is in the rainy seasons much less spirited and quick-footed; and to this circumstance the fact is, perhaps, to be traced, that the Oriental asses are so remarkably superior to those in our countries; and as in Egypt rain belongs to the rare phenomena, the asses there have a peculiar excellence. The ass was, and is still, much valued in the East; and whilst it is in the modern languages used as an insult and a by-word, it is perfectly the contrary in Oriental phraseology (see Gen. xlix. 14; Iliad. xi. 588, *et seq.*). On account of its safe step, it was, in mountainous regions, the only riding animal in the times before Solomon, even for females and wealthy individuals (1 Kings ii. 40).—*And he returned to the land of Egypt*, with his wife and children, whom he, however, most probably sent back to Midian after the event related in ver. 24—26, as appears from xviii. 2—6; for, as Ebn Ezra remarks, it would not have been wise for Moses to take his family to Egypt, from whence he intended to lead forth all the Israelites. Abarbanel, however, observes that Moses took his wife and children with him to Egypt, in order to convince the Israelites of his unlimited confidence in the promise and assistance of God; for if he had feared the least danger, he would not have exposed his family to it by bringing them to Egypt. But with this opinion it would be difficult to understand the beginning of the 18th chapter, where the wife and children of Moses are said to

who sought thy life. 20. And Moses took his wife and his sons, and [1]made them ride upon an ass, and he returned to the land of Egypt: and Moses took the staff of God into his hand. 21. And the Lord said to Moses, When thou goest to return to Egypt, [2]consider well all the won-

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Set. [2] See, that thou do all these wonders before Pharaoh, which I have put in thy hand.

have been with Jethro, "after Moses had sent them back."—*The staff of God* is the staff with which Moses performed the miracles before the Lord (see ver. 17). The Sept. translates inaccurately, "the staff which he had receivd from God" τὴν ῥάβδον τὴν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ (see ver. 2). Our verse is closely connected with ver. 24, *et seq.* With great propriety the inspired author introduces, on the momentous point of the departure from Midian, once more a concise summary of the whole end and course of the great mission; and this insertion is therefore so far from interrupting the context that it is a peculiar beauty of composition.

21. We have translated literally with the Septuagint, "*see* or *consider well* all the wonders," etc. The English Version (as also the Vulgate, Luther, and De Wette) render more the sense than the words: "see that thou do all those wonders."—*Which I shall have put into thy hand.* As Moses was not only to perform the three signs above mentioned (ver. 2—9), but also all the wonders not yet communicated to him, it would be improper to translate, as the English Version does: *Do before Pharaoh the wonders which I have put into thy hand.* We are therefore compelled to take שמתי here as a *futurum exactum*, "at the time when it will be necessary to perform the wonders before Pharaoh, I shall have put them into thy hand"; or as a simple future: "I shall put them," etc.—*But I shall harden his heart and he will not let the people go.* It is well known, that this and the similar passages, which appear to make God the author and originator of sin and refractoriness, have, from the earliest times, caused violent attacks, which theologians and philosophers have always found necessary to refute anew. We can hardly agree with those who assert, that Pharaoh forfeited, by the cruelty which he perpetrated against the Hebrews, every claim or right to forgiveness, and that he therefore fell a prey to divine revenge: which opinion certainly disregards the all-merciful Father of mankind, who is "good and just, and shows the right way to the sinner" (Ps. xxv. 9). However, the same idea is implied in Whiston's remark (on *Josephus*, Antiq. VII. ix. 6): "This reflection of Josephus, that God brought to nought the dangerous counsel of Ahithophel, and directly infatuated wicked Absalom to reject it (which infatuation is what the Scripture styles the judicial hardening the hearts, and blinding the eyes of men, who by their former voluntary wickedness have justly deserved to be destroyed, and are thereby brought to destruction), is a very just one, and in him not unfrequent. Nor does Josephus ever puzzle himself, or perplex his readers, with subtile hypotheses as to the manner of such judicial infatuations by God, while the justice of them is generally so obvious." But with such apodictic sentences we gain nothing, and the solution of that highly important and interesting problem, which involves the momentous question about predestination and free will, is thereby in no manner promoted. We pass by such opinions as that of Hales (Chron. II. i. 194), who infers from Matthew xii. 43, that "when *God* is said to harden Pharaoh's heart, it was in reality hardened by *diabolical influence* or *demoniacal possession*"; for such views, far from removing the difficulty, render it still more obscure and intricate, by introducing notions absolutely foreign to the Pentateuch.

אֲשֶׁר־שַׂמְתִּי בְיָדֶךָ וַעֲשִׂיתָם לִפְנֵי פַרְעֹה וַאֲנִי אֲחַזֵּק אֶת־לִבּוֹ
וְלֹא יְשַׁלַּח אֶת־הָעָם : 22 וְאָמַרְתָּ אֶל־פַּרְעֹה כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה
בְּנִי בְכֹרִי יִשְׂרָאֵל : 23 וָאֹמַר אֵלֶיךָ שַׁלַּח אֶת־בְּנִי וְיַעַבְדֵנִי
וַתְּמָאֵן לְשַׁלְּחוֹ הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי הֹרֵג אֶת־בִּנְךָ בְּכֹרֶךָ : 24 וַיְהִי

It is a remarkable circumstance, that the expression, "God hardened Pharaoh's heart" recurs seven times (Exodus iv. 21; vii. 3; ix. 12; x. 1, 20, 27; xi. 10), and that the phrase, "Pharaoh himself hardened his heart," is as often repeated (Exod. vii. 13, 22; viii. 11, 15, 28; ix. 7, 34); further, that the first and last time, when similar expressions are used, *God* is represented as the source of the obstinacy of Pharaoh, so that the contumacy of the king seems to be only the *effect* of the intention of God to obdurate his mind. For the explanation of these momentous questions, which belong more to the philosophy of religion than to a Biblical commentary, we refer to our "Lecture on Predestination and Free Will," in which we have endeavoured to elucidate this difficult subject. In general, we observe:

1. The difference between the *omniscience* of God and his *predestination*, if always properly regarded, will remove, in a great measure, the obscurity of such passages, so that they amount to the sense of the words (iii. 19): "And I know that the king of Egypt will not let you go, even not by a mighty hand"—in which words no critic will find any objectionable idea.

2. As the external, often accidental, *occasion* of an event is mostly more obvious, even to the reflecting mind, than its primary cause or its true (often hidden) originator, it has become a linguistic peculiarity in most ancient, especially the Semitic, languages, to use indiscriminately the former instead of the latter, so that the phrase, "I shall harden the heart of Pharaoh" means: I know that I shall be *the cause* of Pharaoh's obstinacy; my commandments and wonders will be an *occasion*, an *inducement* to an increasing obduration of his heart. And the compassionate leniency of God, who, instead of crushing the haughtiness of the refractory king with one powerful blow, first tried to reform him by various less awful punishments, and who generally announced the time of the occurrence of the plagues by the words, "Behold I shall afflict to-morrow," in order to grant him time for reflection and repentance; this clemency on the part of God increased Pharaoh's refractoriness; it was to him *a cause* of prolonged and renewed resistance.

3. The opinion of Luther and his followers, that God *allows* the sin of man, without causing it, not only not removes the difficulty, but adds new objections to our problem. If God sees the wicked man meditate pernicious schemes, which He might by His mere will destroy, and yet permits the nefarious deeds to be executed, even the pious heart might doubt of the divine interference in the affairs of man, and lose the firm belief in the strict justice of God. Thus the world would in reality become a prey to chance, or to the arbitrariness of the impious, who are allowed to carry out without check or control their mischievous plans. But nothing except the unshaken confidence in the direction and *sole* government of God, who reigns supreme over mankind and their fates, can satisfy the religious mind in its reflections on the destinies of individuals and of nations. Every deed, whether good or evil, is a means in the hand of God; however, the evil deed is not converted into a blessing because it happens to have been performed, but because God designed it from the beginning as an instrument of His will and His higher decrees; just as Joseph replied to his brothers: "You intended it as an evil against me, but God intended it as a

ders, which I shall have put into thy hand; and thou shalt do them before Pharaoh: but I shall harden his heart, and he will not let the people go. 22. And thou shalt say to Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, Israel *is* my son, *even* my firstborn: 23. And I say to thee, Let my son go, that he may serve me: and if thou refusest to let him go, behold, I shall slay thy son, *even* thy firstborn. 24. And it came to pass by the way, [1]in the resting-place

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—In the inn.

blessing." The deed of man, and the will of God, go hand in hand; they are contemporary, they are, in fact, identical.

4. The whole spirit of the Pentateuch utterly excludes the idea, that God infatuated Pharaoh, merely in order to punish him; that He first compels man to wickedness, and then calls him to account for it. The origin of sin, as related in the third chapter of Genesis, is alone sufficient to impress upon us the conviction, that free choice and unfettered will are granted to man, to pursue virtue and to shun crime (see Deut. ii. 26). The Mosaic legislation is entirely and exclusively based on the doctrine of retaliation; and the exclamation of Isaiah (iii. 10, 11): "Say ye to the righteous that they shall be blessed, for they shall enjoy the fruits of their actions. Woe to the wicked; for the reward of their hands they shall reap;" this idea forms the leading principle of the whole Old Testament. Misfortune is the consequence of sin, as virtue is the necessary cause of happiness; and both bliss and misery stand again under the higher supervision of Providence. Therefore, admitting even that phrases like that of our text are obscure, they cannot possibly be used to overthrow a clear fundamental doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, which would, without it, be deprived of their most divine principle.

22. *Israel is my son, even my first-born* (בכרי), that is, Israel is that nation which knew and adored me the first among all generations of men, and which I have, therefore, more especially taken under the wings of my protection, loving them as a father loves his first-born son, on whom he places his entire hope and pride. It is less appropriate to take, with Rashi, the word בכרי here in the signification of *greatness*, as in Ps. lxxxix. 28. where David is called בְּכוֹר, which is explained in the second part of the verse by: "the highest among the kings of the earth." — It may be mentioned, that Moses never, in addressing Pharaoh, either before or after a plague, uses the words here commanded to him, *Israel is my first-born son*, but only, *send my people* (v. 1; vi. 16; vii. 26, etc).

23. *And if thou refusest* (ותמאן) *to let him go.* About ו in the signification of *if*, see note on iii. 13, ואמרו לי.—*Behold, I shall slay thy son, even thy first-born.* Although this menace was pronounced to Pharaoh only before the last plague, God mentions it already here, because it contained the severest and most fearful punishment, and stood in exact correspondence with the obduracy of Pharaoh, who should lose his first-born son because he oppressed the first-born son of God. But Rashi believes that Moses addressed these words to Pharaoh already at his first appearance before him, in order to show, from the beginning, the dreadful judgment of the Almighty which awaited his obstinacy; for "the loving-kindness of God warns man, in due season, to return from his wickedness."

24. *And it came to pass by the way, in the resting-place for the night.* מָלוֹן (derived from לוּן, to stay over night, and the מ locale), the place where travellers

בַּדֶּרֶךְ בַּמָּלוֹן וַיִּפְגְּשֵׁהוּ יְהֹוָה וַיְבַקֵּשׁ הֲמִיתוֹ׃ 25 וַתִּקַּח צִפֹּרָה
צֹר וַתִּכְרֹת אֶת־עָרְלַת בְּנָהּ וַתַּגַּע לְרַגְלָיו וַתֹּאמֶר כִּי חֲתַן־

stop for the night, resting-place; Onkelos: בֵּית מְבָתָא, locus pernoctationis; Septuagint: ἐν τῷ καταλύματι. At present there are, in the East, instead of our inns or hotels, in suitable intervals, in towns, villages, and on the open road, houses which offer shelter during the night, for travellers and their animals, mostly gratuitously; sometimes, also, provisions are sold there for moderate prices (such buildings are called in Arabic, *Mansils*, *Chans*, or *Caravansaries*; in Greek, πανδοχεῖα; in Chaldaic, פונדקי). But such houses were unknown to the Israelites in the earlier periods; they had a מָלוֹן, which is either a moveable tent temporarily pitched up for the night, or a cavern adapted for the purpose of pernoctation; and it is known that, even at present, travellers use such tents for resting-places during the night in the very vicinity of towns. We have, therefore, rejected the rendering of מָלוֹן by *inn*, as it is given by the English Version; besides, inns were, in the East where the virtue of hospitality is practised with the conscientiousness and cheerfulness of a religious duty, almost superfluous, although there were a few in less populous regions (see *Niebuhr*, Travels, 46; *Robinson*, iii. 480, 575; *Wellsted*, ii. 218).—*The Lord met him, and sought to kill him.* Instead of *God*, Onkelos, the Septuagint, and the Arabic Version, have here *the angel of God.*—Although this, and the two following verses (which belong together) are obscure, and not without difficulties, they are not nearly so unintelligible as the critical zeal of many interpreters has represented them.—1st. The context shows clearly, that the pronouns belonging to the two verbs, the Lord met *him*, and sought to kill *him*, refer, necessarily, to Moses, and not to the child, which has never been mentioned before (the poetical diction in passages like Psalm lxxxvii. 1, can decide nothing for the prosaical connections), and which was too innocent to have deserved death. 2nd. It is further clear (from ver. 26), that the reason why the Lord sought to kill Moses, was, his neglect in circumcising his (no doubt new-born) second son, Eliezer (see on ver. 20), a neglect the more culpable in Moses, as circumcision was, hitherto, the only sign of the covenant between God and Israel; and as he, who had been sent to renew that alliance, was, above all others, bound to perform and respect that symbol. Therefore are the opinions of those who find the guilt of Moses in his having taken his family with him into the land of idolatry, or in having occupied himself too much with the worldly comforts for the night, gratuitous conjectures rather than genuine explanations of our text. Even the interpretation of Abarbanel, who observes, that the spirit of prophecy descended upon Moses at the resting-place, but, absorbed as he was, by temporal anxieties, he was unable to receive and apply it, is more specious than real; for פָּגַשׁ is, simply, *to meet*, *to find* (Gen. xxxii. 18; Isaiah xxxiv, 14, etc.), and it would, besides, be difficult to comprehend how the spirit of prophecy "sought to kill Moses." More plausible is the supposition of Ebn Ezra, that Moses fell suddenly into a serious illness, which reminded him of his transgression, and convinced him that he was in danger of death, unless he corrected it without delay. It is unnecessary to mention the various artificial conjectures which this verse has been doomed to call forth.

25. *Then Zipporah took a sharp stone.* צר = צור (from צרר, which is identical with צור, *to cut*), a sharp stone, hence a stone knife. Justly, therefore, translate Onkelos and Jonathan טינרא, *a stone;* and Ebn Ezra explains דבר חד, "a sharp instrument;" and similarly most of the other interpreters. In Joshua v. 2, 3, we read that the circumcision of the people was performed with חרבות צורים, that is,

over night, that the Lord met him, and sought to kill him. 25. Then Zipporah took a sharp stone, and cut off the foreskin of her son, and [1]put *it* at his feet, and said,

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Cast.

knives of sharp stones, evidently coinciding with the instrument named in our text. The use of stones for similar purposes, was prevalent in the East, even in times when the application of metal instruments of all kinds was long known and universally adopted. According to Ludolf (Descript. of Ethiopia, iii. 1. § 21), the Alnaji, an Ethiopian tribe, used sharpened flints for the circumcision of their children; and they continue this practice most probably to this day. According to Herodotus (ii. 86), the Egyptians opened the bodies, which were to be embalmed, with flint-knives. Pliny (Hist. Nat. xxxv. 12) informs us, that the priests of Cybele used similar instruments for their castration. According to Josephus (Antiq. XIV. iv. 1), the rind of trees which contained balm, was opened with stone knives. Diodorus Siculus (iii. 15) mentions that the Ichthyophagi, on the Arabian Sea, open their fish with sharp flints. The American tribes made battle-axes, knives and daggers, of stone before they knew the application of the metals. And even now those Jewish male children who die before the eighth day from their birth, are circumcised with stone knives. —*And she cut off the foreskin of her son, and put it at his feet* (ותגע לרגליו), *and said, Thou art indeed a bridegroom of blood to me* (חתן־דמים). We explain these obscure words in the simplest manner, thus: Zipporah circumcised (cut off the foreskin) of her son—for Moses was unable to perform the ceremony on account of his illness, and laid it before the feet of this son, exclaiming, with a mixed feeling of indignation and tenderness, "Although all Hebrew children, from the blood of circumcision, (by which alone they are received into the covenant of the Lord), might justly be called bridegrooms, or sons of blood, thou, Eliezer, deservest indeed (in reality) this name much more, because the neglect of that circumcision had almost caused the death of my husband." It appears to us impossible to refer the pronouns "at *his* feet," and "*thou* art indeed," to any other substantive but the son, the only masculine noun in the whole sentence; they cannot apply to Moses (as Onkelos, Jonathan, Saadiah, Rashi, Abarbanel, Glass, Frishmuth, Rosenmüller, and others suppose), nor, much less, to the destroying angel (מלאך החבלה, which Jonathan and Targum Hiers. substitute for 'יי). The word חתן, which appears here to be used designedly, includes, most happily, the two significations of relative or bridegroom, and circumcision (compare, in Arabic, خَتَن any relative on the part of the wife, and خِتان circumcision); and, since the circumcision was considered as a symbol of the covenant between God and the child, it might, poetically, be compared with a matrimonial alliance. Ebn Ezra observes, that "women call their circumcised children *bridegrooms*," and the child is, even at present, on the day of his circumcision, named among the Israelites "bridegroom of the covenant." We have, therefore, translated, "bridegroom of blood," instead of "bloody husband," which the English Version offers. The particle כִּי before חתן־דמים, signifies here, as frequently, *indeed* (see note on iii. 7), "Thee I might call literally and really a bridegroom of blood." Targum Onkelos and Targum Jonathan express the sense almost correctly; the former renders, "by the blood of circumcision of this one, my husband has been restored to me;" the latter, "and Zipporah said: 'My husband wished to circumcise the child, but his father-in-law prevented him; but now the blood of circumcision will expiate the guilt of my husband.'" The Septuagint

דָּמִים אַתָּה לִי׃ 26 וַיִּרֶף מִמֶּנּוּ אָז אָמְרָה חֲתַן דָּמִים
לַמּוּלֹת׃ פ
27 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־אַהֲרֹן לֵךְ לִקְרַאת מֹשֶׁה הַמִּדְבָּרָה וַיֵּלֶךְ וַיִּפְגְּשֵׁהוּ
בְּהַר הָאֱלֹהִים וַיִּשַּׁק־לוֹ׃ 28 וַיַּגֵּד מֹשֶׁה לְאַהֲרֹן אֵת כָּל־דִּבְרֵי
יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר שְׁלָחוֹ וְאֵת כָּל־הָאֹתֹת אֲשֶׁר צִוָּהוּ׃ 29 וַיֵּלֶךְ

offers a remarkable deviation from our text: *ἔστη τὸ αἷμα τῆς περιτομῆς τοῦ παιδίου μου*: "the blood of circumcision of my son has ceased," which seems to be based on a quite different reading of the Hebrew text. Gesenius explains the words ותגע לרגליו thus: "and she touched the feet of Moses with the blood of the child, which is the rite of expiation." But, 1st. the word *blood* is not before mentioned; and 2nd. as חתן־דמים is referred to the child, we should have a very singular change in the application of the pronouns (similar are the interpretations of Abulwalid, Kimchi, Spencer, Pococke, Mendelssohn, and others). Of the numberless other explanations, we give only that of Rosenmüller, which is not without some appearance of probability: "Zipporah threw, with a certain indignation, the foreskin before the feet of Moses, and said to him: 'I am compelled to redeem and preserve you by blood, namely, that of my son; for unless I had circumcised him, and thus shed his blood, thy life would have been forfeited.'" (Similarly Glaire). But to this interpretation also applies the objection, that the pronoun in לְרַגְלָיו cannot refer to Moses, who is mentioned neither in this nor in the preceding verse.—The reason why Moses neglected such an important duty as that of the circumcision of his son, has been sought in the supposition that Eliezer was, perhaps, born only a few days before the departure of Moses from Midian; and, not wishing to delay the mission which God had entrusted to him, he took the child with him, intending to perform in Egypt the circumcision, which he feared might be dangerous during the journey. But it is more probable, that Zipporah, adhering to the custom of the Arabians, who, considering the operation perilous and improper in such young infants, circumcise their children only at their thirteenth year, had persuaded Moses to postpone that sacred ceremony.

26. *And He desisted from him*, namely, God desisted from Moses, or, in other words, the illness of the latter ceased; thus Zipporah became perfectly convinced that the danger into which her husband had fallen was occasioned by the neglected circumcision of their child, and she, therefore, exclaimed again in the words: *a bridegroom of blood thou art, because of the circumcision* (למולת). The verb רפה (of which וירף is the futurum apocopatum kal), to relax, to desist (Judges viii. 3; Neh. vi. 9), is used in connection with plagues or diseases, so 1 Chron. xxi. 15. The Septuagint inaccurately, *ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*; Vulgate, dimisit eum. Grotius, however, and several ancient commentators, translate: "and she [Zipporah] left him," on account of xviii. 2 (see ver. 20 of this chapter); but this would require ותרף, instead of וירף.—למולת, the *plural* of this form is a Hebraism, applied in the same verse in the word דמים; all the conjectures, therefore, striving to find in this word an allusion to two kinds of circumcisions or dangers, are futile. The preposition ל in למולת, signifies *concerning, respecting* (see xiv. 3): "thou art a bridegroom of blood, but not so far as to cause the death of my husband, but only as regards the blood of circumcision." Targum Onkelos renders incorrectly: "but for the blood of circumcision of this

[1]Thou *art* indeed a bridegroom of blood to me. 26. So
He [2]desisted from him: then she said, A [3]bridegroom of
blood *thou art*, because of the circumcision. 27. And the
Lord said to Aaron, Go into the wilderness to meet Moses.
And he went, and met him in the mountain of God, and
kissed him. 28. And Moses told Aaron all the words of
the Lord [4]which He had charged him, and all the signs
which He had commanded him. 29. And Moses and

[1] *Engl. Vers.* — Surely a bloody husband *art* thou to me. [2] Let him go. [3] A bloody husband. [4] Who had sent him.

child, my husband would have incurred a crime of death." Targum Jonathan and Jerusalem paraphrase freely: "Then began Zipporah hymns of praise, saying: 'How dear is this blood of circumcision, which has rescued my husband from the hand of the destroying angel!'"—We believe that, after the explanation given on this passage (ver. 24—26), its meaning and connection will be intelligible; however, if it should be asked why this event is related in such obscure phraseology, we may advert to the great art of composition displayed in this point also. The whole occurrence is a mysterious act of divine warning and retribution; Moses' illness was a "rod of correction" in the hand of God; he felt and understood the divine chastisement, and was delivered from his imminent danger. Over this event a transparent veil is spread, not to conceal the guilt of Moses, but to allow a larger scope to imagination to represent it to itself in its whole extent.

27. *And he went, and met him in the mountain of God*, that is, Mount Horeb (see our note on iii. 1). Targum Onkelos and Jonathan render here also: "the mountain on which the Lord was revealed." If we compare the relative geographical position of the nomadic part of Midian (see our note on ii. 15), and of Lower Egypt, of which Goshen was a province, we cannot but see that Moses must, for some purpose not related in our text, have gone again so much southwards as Mount Horeb, perhaps because this was the most appropriate place to meet Aaron, whom he would have missed in the extended pathless desert.—*And he* (*Aaron*) *kissed him* (*Moses*); the Septuagint has *κατεφίλησαν* ἀλλήλους (see ver. 14). Ebn Ezra observes on this verse: "Aaron was not gifted with prophecy, nor was there any occasion for it; for Moses was the messenger despatched to Pharaoh, and he sent Aaron to the Israelites, and Miriam to their wives." Abarbanel, however, finds in the expression, that Moses and Aaron "met at the mountain of God," an allegorical allusion, that the spirit of prophecy had descended on both brothers.

28. *And Moses told Aaron all the words of the Lord which He had charged him* (אשר שלחו). The usual translation, *who had sent him*, is languid in the extreme; and makes these words a superfluous addition. But שלח is sometimes construed with a double accusative in the signification of *charging somebody with some commission*, for instance, quite similar to our passage in 2 Sam. xi. 22: "and he told David *all things which Joab had charged him*" (שלחו); see also Isaiah lv. 11. Similarly already the Septuagint, οὓς ἀπέστειλε; Vulgate, quibus miserat eum; Mendelssohn, die er ihn auszurichten gesendet hatte; and others.

29. *And Moses and Aaron went.* If the verb precedes, it may be put in the singular, even if more than one substantive follows. The regular construction is applied in v. 1. About *the elders of the children of Israel*, see note on iii. 16.

מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן וַיַּאַסְפוּ אֶת־כָּל־זִקְנֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ 30 וַיְדַבֵּר
אַהֲרֹן אֵת כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וַיַּעַשׂ
הָאֹתֹת לְעֵינֵי הָעָם׃ 31 וַיַּאֲמֵן הָעָם וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ כִּי־פָקַד יְהוָה
אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְכִי רָאָה אֶת־עָנְיָם וַיִּקְּדוּ וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ׃ שביעי

30. *And Aaron spoke all the words which the Lord had spoken to Moses*; in harmony with the command of God, who appointed Aaron as the interpreter between Moses and the people (see ver. 16); to which tradition adds, that after the death of the latter, Eliezer, the son of Moses, performed the same function.—*And he did the signs before the eyes of the people*, namely the three signs described in verses 2—9. Although the readiness of Aaron to co-operate with Moses, and the sympathy which the exhortations and promises of both excited among the Israelites, strongly prove that the hope of returning to the land of their ancestors, was a lively and dearly-cherished feeling among them, yet the peculiar, enthusiastic character common to all eastern nations, imposed upon Moses the necessity of proving by miracles, that he was indeed the divine delegate; and even more than two thousand years later, Mohammed was compelled to display certain miracles in order to gain the confidence of his superstitious countrymen.

31. The Septuagint renders וישמעו with *καὶ ἐχάρη*, *and they rejoiced*, as if it had read וישמחו. About the signification of פָּקַד see our note on iii. 16. Mendelssohn translates, in accordance with the interpretation of Ebn Ezra: "they *understood* from the signs of Moses, that the time of redemption predicted to Abraham (Gen. xv. 16) had arrived." But the usual signification of שָׁמַע seems here preferable.—*Then they bowed down and prostrated themselves* (ויקדו וישתחוו). Although these verbs are likewise used

ה 1 וְאַחַר בָּאוּ מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֶל־פַּרְעֹה כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה

CHAPTER V.

Summary.—Moses and Aaron proceed to the court of Pharaoh, and request him, in the name of the God of Israel, to allow the Hebrews to celebrate, after a three days' journey into the wilderness, a festival to their God. Pharaoh answers with scorn, that he does not know that God, nor was he willing to obey His commandments. When Moses and Aaron repeated the same demand, the king, in an ebullition of passion, pronounces the edict, that henceforth no straw should be given to the Israelites for the bricks, which they had to make, but that they should seek it themselves, and yet furnish the same amount of bricks as before; for he supposed that the request of Moses and Aaron was only a pretext for gratifying the idleness and rebellious disposition of the Hebrews. As the Israelitish labourers were not able to satisfy the increased demands of the king, the overseers, who were responsible for every deficiency in their work, were severely treated by the Egyptian task-masters; they complained before Pharaoh, who, however, only repeated his former tyrannical edict. In this distressed position they reproached Moses and Aaron with their thoughtless schemes, which had only tended to bring down new misery upon them. Moses, in grief and despondency, addressed his prayers to the Lord, asking wherefore it was necessary to send him to Pharaoh, if his mission was destined to increase, instead of diminishing, the calamity of His people.

1. *And afterwards* (ואחר), the adverb as in Gen. x. 18; xviii. 5, etc. Only after having succeeded in securing the firm confidence of the people, Moses could represent to Pharaoh the request of God, and accompanied by Aaron—but probably not the elders of Israel (see on iii. 18)—he proceeds to the court, where

Aaron went and assembled all the elders of the children of Israel: 30. And Aaron spoke all the words which the Lord had spoken to Moses, and did all the signs before the eyes of the people. 31. And the people believed: and when they heard that the Lord had [1]taken regard of the children of Israel, and that He had looked upon their affliction, then they bowed down and prostrated themselves.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Visited.

with reference to *man* (Gen. xxiii. 7), and this kind of homage is, without distinction, rendered to all representatives of God, as kings and prophets; it appears here more in harmony with the context to explain that the Israelites prostrated themselves before *God*, rather than before Moses and Aaron. For Moses was so obviously the direct and immediate messenger of God, that it would have been preposterous to worship the servant, and not the Lord; and so deeply did the people feel the presence of God, that they were, at this moment, full of firm and genuine belief, whilst later, when the manifest instrumentality of Moses was, in some degree, obliterated from their minds, their sceptical disposition displayed itself in all its invidiousness. It is worthy of remark, that "a mere passive consent of the Israelites is all that Moses requires, for which he promises deliverance; he does not insist on any active co-operation on their part; he enjoins neither courage, discipline, enterprise, nor mutual confidence; nothing which might render insurrection formidable, or indicate an organised plan of resistance." וישתחוו, from שחה, with ו interposed, after the analogy of מְטַחֲוֵי, from טחה, Gen. xxi. 16.

CHAP. V. 1. And afterwards Moses and Aaron [1]came and said to Pharaoh, Thus [2]hath the Lord God of Israel

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Went in. [2] Saith.

he is not only unknown to the king—who is the *successor* of him whose daughter had adopted and educated him (see ii. 23) —but also to the whole royal household, which during the forty years of his absence from Egypt must have considerably, if not entirely, been changed or remodelled. No doubt Aaron alone addressed Pharaoh (iv. 15, 16), and the plural, *they spoke*, is used because he did so in the name of Moses also; and the assertion that they spoke *both together*, because God had promised Moses: "I shall be with thy mouth and with his [Aaron's] mouth," is the more surprising, proceeding as it does from such a rational commentator as Ebn Ezra.—*Thus hath the Lord God of Israel said.* יהוה is here (as in ver. 3) described as the national or peculiar God of Israel or the Hebrews, of whom Pharaoh himself confesses (ver. 2) to be ignorant—a sufficient proof for unbiassed critics, that the Tetragrammaton is neither derived from an Egyptian source, nor, much less, imparted to Moses by Egyptian priests (see note on iii. 14).—*My nation*, i. e., that nation, which knows and worships me, and which I have therefore taken under my special protection and providence (see on iv. 22).—ויחגו future kal of חגג, to celebrate a feast; this root might be kindred with חוג, to move round, to dance: and that festivals were celebrated by the Hebrews with dances, is evident from many passages (see xv. 20; xxxi. 7;

אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שַׁלַּח אֶת־עַמִּי וְיָחֹגּוּ לִי בַּמִּדְבָּר׃ 2 וַיֹּאמֶר
פַּרְעֹה מִי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר אֶשְׁמַע בְּקֹלוֹ לְשַׁלַּח אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא
יָדַעְתִּי אֶת־יְהוָה וְגַם אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא אֲשַׁלֵּחַ׃ 3 וַיֹּאמְרוּ
אֱלֹהֵי הָעִבְרִים נִקְרָא עָלֵינוּ נֵלֲכָה־נָּא דֶּרֶךְ שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים

Judg. xxi. 19, 21; 2 Sam. vi. 13, 16); here it implies particularly sacrifices to be offered in honour of God (see iii. 18); and this signification of חג is substantiated by several phrases (Psalms cxviii. 27. Isaiah xxix. 1).—*In the desert.* The Israelites wished to sacrifice to God in the desert, not in Egypt before the eyes of the Egyptians, who would have been stimulated to fanatic fury by witnessing the Hebrews killing the animals which were to themselves objects of worship and adoration (see viii. 22). Besides, this request must have appeared the less surprising to the Egyptians, as they also seem to have celebrated religious festivals in the desert. Near Sarabit-el-Khadim, in the wilderness, a locality has been found covered with old Egyptian edifices and monuments, on which the names of Egyptian kings are engraved. It is probable that the Egyptians frequently resorted to this and similar other places, for the celebration of religious festivals.—Which was the residence of Pharaoh is a disputed question, to be decided either in favour of Memphis (in the neighbourhood of Cairo); or—which is far more probable—for Zoan or Tanis, near the mouth of one of the eastern arms of the Nile, in the Delta. If there were no other proof for the latter supposition but the repeated statement, that Moses performed his wonders "in the field of Zoan" (Psalms lxxviii. 12, 43); it would be sufficient to remove every uncertainty. But further, in the passage (Num. xiii. 23): "and Hebron was built seven years before Zoan of Egypt," the capital is evidently alluded to. Other passages (as Gen xlv. 10; xlvi. 28, 29. Exod. ii. 3, 5), show, that the residence of Pharaoh must have been in the immediate vicinity of the abode of the Israelites of Goshen, which would agree well with Zoan. Osburn (Mon. Hist. ii. 575) believes that the interviews of Moses with Pharaoh took place in "Raamses or Rameses, which was situated on the western border of the Delta, about midway between the Canopic branch of the Nile and the canal of Alexandria." These words contain two mistakes: 1. Raamses is not identical with Rameses, the former is the *town*, the latter is the *province*, synonymous with Goshen; and 2. Raamses does not lie on the western, but the eastern border of the Delta; it was not built for a royal residence, but for a fortified store city (see note on i. 11).—The Pharaoh whom Moses addressed, was Amenophis, the sixteenth, or last king of the eighteenth Diospolitanic dynasty (see *Introduction* § 2, iii. 2.)

2. *Who is the Lord*, etc. These words of Pharaoh, who, relying upon the power of his own gods, openly defies the chastisement of all other deities, are the intense and revolting expression of the impotent wantonness of an arbitrary tyrant against an unhappy and oppressed nation, and the sum of his overweening obstinacy, which unavoidably called down upon him and his country the punishment of a justly recompensing Providence. The Septuagint translates, with omission of the holy name of God: Τίς ἐστιν οὗ εἰσακούσομαι τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ. Onkelos renders: "the name of יהוה has not been revealed to me"; and Jonathan, still more significantly corroborating our remarks in the preceding verse, paraphrases thus: "The name of יהוה has not been revealed to me.... I do not find in the book of the angels (deities) the name of יהוה mentioned, and therefore I do not fear him" (see note to iii. 13).—*I know not the Lord.* "Although the Pharaohs of Egypt knew God by the name of Elohim (Gen.

said, Let my people go, that they may hold a feast to me in the desert: 2. And Pharaoh said, Who is the Lord, whose voice I shall obey to let Israel go? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go. 3. And they said, The God of the Hebrews hath met us: let us

xli. 38, 39), they were ignorant of the holy designation of the Almighty; they refused therefore to allow the departure of the Israelites, whom they wished to serve *them* alone as their supreme sovereigns, and not their God" (*Ebn Ezra*). Compare about this verse also Cusari iv. 15.

3. *And they said, the God of the Hebrews hath met us.* Moses obviously answers the spiteful question of Pharaoh: "Who is the Lord"? with the words: "He is the God of the Hebrews, whom you should know, who has shown Himself so mighty and zealous for the protection of His worshippers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the very ancestors of those whom you now treat with such unparalleled rigour." About נקרא עלינו, for which we read in iii. 18, נקרה עלינו, see our note to that verse, where will be found also a justification of the apparent pretext of Moses to lead the Israelites into the desert merely for the purpose of sacrificing to God. We observe, however, that Onkelos renders here, "he has revealed himself to us," whilst he interprets at the former passage, "his name is called upon us."—*Lest He fall upon us with pestilence* (יפגענו בדבר) *or the sword.* פָּגַע is originally to strike, to plague, like נָגַע, in which signification it is used in our passage; derived therefrom are the meanings: to urge, to assail with petitions, to meet with any one, to reach any one. It is generally followed by ב of the person; but here it is construed with the accusative of the person and ב of the thing. The Septuagint translates inaccurately *μήποτε συναντήσῃ ἡμῖν θάνατος ἢ φόνος*. Similarly Vulgate, Luther, and others. The suffix (lest he fall *upon us*) refers simply to the Israelites, who, according to the common notions of antiquity, fear the anger of the deity, if they neglect to offer their sacrifices in due time. But we are yet by no means prepared to subscribe Wilson's immoderate remark: "The Elohim of the early Jews (?) appears to have been originally conceived *in the spirit of Milton's Moloch* (!) The idea seems to have been that the withholding of the bloody sacrifice would *goad him into a fit of destructive fury.*" It is needless to animadvert upon the impropriety of an observation which, heedless in itself, is in perfect antagonism not only with the whole spirit of the Old Test. but with distinct passages like the following: "Hath the Lord a delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey *is* better than sacrifice, *and* to hearken than the fat of rams" (1 Sam. xv. 22. Compare Hos. vi. 6. Isaiah i. 11, 12. Psalms. xl. 7; li. 18, 19). Ebn Ezra and Abarbanel are of opinion, that the suffix includes Pharaoh and his people in the general calamity, the former being the chief impediment to the proper veneration of God; and Rashi, *by way of euphemism*, understands the king alone, whom Moses, from motives of fear or respect, hesitated to mention, although he knew perfectly well from the predictions of God (iv. 22, 23), that fearful misery would be the inevitable consequence of his disobedience. But it is unnecessary to go beyond the clear and obvious interpretation.

4. *Wherefore do you, Moses and Aaron, disturb* (תַּפְרִיעוּ) *the people from their works?* The verb פרע has the general meaning of loosening or relaxing; therefore it signifies in Kal: to give the reins (Exodus xxxii. 25); in Niphal he is become unbridled (effrenatus factus est) (Prov. xxix. 18); and in Hiphil, similar to Kal, to avert, to distort. Hence it

בַּמִּדְבָּר וְנִזְבְּחָה לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ פֶּן־יִפְגָּעֵנוּ בַּדֶּבֶר אוֹ בֶחָרֶב׃
4 וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם לָמָּה מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן תַּפְרִיעוּ אֶת־
הָעָם מִמַּעֲשָׂיו לְכוּ לְסִבְלֹתֵיכֶם׃ 5 וַיֹּאמֶר פַּרְעֹה הֵן־רַבִּים
עַתָּה עַם־הָאָרֶץ וְהִשְׁבַּתֶּם אֹתָם מִסִּבְלֹתָם׃ 6 וַיְצַו פַּרְעֹה

will be easy to estimate the different translations of תפריעו proposed by ancient and modern commentators. Targum Onkelos and Jonathan render aptly תבטלון; the Septuagint, *διαστρέφετε*; Rashi: "derange and call from their work"; similarly Ebn Ezra and Rashbam; the Vulgate less strictly: Quare sollicitatis; and Luther: why do you wish to release the people?—לכו לסבלתיכם *Go you to your burdens.* As Moses and Aaron alone are here represented as speaking to Pharaoh (see ver. 1), these words of the king can possibly only be addressed to them, implying, however, indirectly the whole people, as the representatives and champions of which Moses and Aaron are justly considered. We need, therefore, not to suppose with Rosenmüller and others, that this command is addressed to the elders who accompanied Moses and Aaron, nor much less with Mendelssohn, that they were spoken to the whole people, which had also appeared before Pharaoh. Further, Moses and Aaron, as members of the oppressed Hebrew nation, had to share the hard labours of their brethren, to which Pharaoh here commands them to return. It is impossible to understand with Rashi the words, *go you to your burdens*, of the private or domestic occupations of Moses and Aaron; the expression סבלתיכם does not admit of this lenient signification (see i. 11). It is still more hazardous to suppose with Nachmanides, Rashi, and Abarbanel, that not only Moses and Aaron, but the whole tribe of Levi, was exempted from the manual work of their brethren; and that this tribe, which was considered by Pharaoh to consist of the teachers and wise men of the Israelites, enjoyed, besides, other privileges similar to those of the caste of the Egyptian priests. However, the tenour of these verses, and of the concluding part of the preceding chapter (ver. 30) proves, that the tyrannical control, which the Egyptians exercised over the Hebrews, was not so unremitting and relentless as is usually represented (see note to i. 11).

5. *The people of the land* (עַם־הָאָרֶץ) *are already many*; that is, the Israelites, who are a part of the natives of the land, and who, by their sojourn of four hundred years, could be considered as indigenous Egyptians, increase in a menacing degree. It cannot be denied, that the expression עַם־הָאָרֶץ implies a certain contempt, so that Mendelssohn renders well: *the low people* (das gemeine Volk). The Samaritan version reads: "Behold they (the Israelites) are already more numerous than the people of the country (the Egyptians)" as if the Hebrew text were מֵעַם הָאָרֶץ.—*And you will make them rest from their burdens?* Pharaoh, to whom the Israelites are, by their extraordinary increase, an object of apprehension, believes them to be the more dangerous, if relieved from their breathless labours, and thus permitted to enjoy leisure, in which they might be tempted to scheme rebellious plans for their deliverance (see ver. 9). The Sept. translates: "The people is numerous, *μὴ οὖν καταπαύσωμεν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων*, let us therefore not allow them to rest from their labours," as if Pharaoh addressed these words to his council (see i. 10), contrary to our text. Still more free is the translation of the Vulgate: "Multus est populus terrae; videtis quod turba succreverit; quando magis si dederitis eis requiem ab operibus"—as if the cause of Pharaoh's fear was the still greater increase, and not rather

go, we pray thee, a three days' journey into the desert, and sacrifice to the Lord our God; lest He fall upon us with pestilence, or with the sword. 4. And the king of Egypt said to Moses, Wherefore do you, Moses and Aaron, [1]disturb the people from their works? Go you to your burdens. 5. And Pharaoh said *further*, Behold, the people of the land [2]are already many; [3]and you will make them rest from their burdens? 6. And Pharaoh commanded the

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Let. [2] Now are many. [3] And ye make them, etc.

the dangerous leisure of the people. As questionable is the opinion of those, who believe that Pharaoh alludes to the great loss which would be caused to him if so vast a multitude of labourers discontinue their works; but this does not appear adapted to our context. And as if desirous to show what arts might be displayed in the interpretation of an easy and simple verse, Rosenmüller believes, "Pharaoh addressed the words contained in this verse to the task-masters, who are mentioned *in the next verse*, but never before in this chapter.—The last resource to which Pharaoh took refuge for the checking of the increase and energy of the Israelites, after all other devices had failed, was incessant work, under which the tyrant hoped they would lose all self-respect, and forget all aspirations for a more honourable condition and treatment. The greater was necessarily his indignation against Moses and Aaron, who revived in the Hebrews the old feelings of independence and liberty, and made them conscious of the degradation to which they were reduced by the despotism of the king.

6. *And Pharaoh commanded the task-masters of the people* (נגשים) *and their overseers* (שטרים). The former were, most probably, Egyptians, who superintended the public works, and prescribed the tasks to be executed; the latter were Israelites (see vers. 14, 15), who controlled the workmen, watched that those tasks were duly performed, and who were responsible to the former. Thus one נוגש had the superintendance over many שטרים. The real meaning and the exact functions of the Shoterim, is a matter of much dispute; it appears, however, that the question might, in the following manner, be brought to a certain conclusion. There are, especially, two different opinions on the subject, which deserve our notice; the one deriving the word from سطر, *to write;* so that it would be *writer, public registrar*, γραμματεύς, as the Septuagint renders (French *greffier*); the other connecting it with سيطر, *præfectus, overseer, officer*. But as every overseer, or officer, has to furnish reports or accounts, both significations are naturally kindred, and, in reality, but one. "So is مسيطر, praefectus et inspector rei, *commentariensis*, qui annotat quaecumque ad rem curandam et gerandam spectant" (see *Schultens* on Job xxxviii. 33). Hence it will not appear surprising that the שטרים filled the following various offices: 1st. According to our passage they were the medium between their own brethren and the Egyptian task-masters. 2nd. They were the coadjutors of the elders (in Num. xi. 16, the elders themselves; see Deut. xix. 9); 3rd. the assistants of the military commanders (Deut. i. 15; 2 Chron. xxvi. 11), and, 4th. in some respects, the colleagues of the judges (Deut. xvi. 18; Josh. viii. 33; xxiv. 1, 4); and, therefore, elective like them. 5th. They performed the functions of *censors*, or comptrollers, of the army (1 Chron. xxvii. 1); and, 6th. They

בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא אֶת־הַנֹּגְשִׂים בָּעָם וְאֶת־שֹׁטְרָיו לֵאמֹר׃ 7 לֹא
תֹאסִפוּן לָתֵת תֶּבֶן לָעָם לִלְבֹּן הַלְּבֵנִים כִּתְמוֹל שִׁלְשֹׁם הֵם
יֵלְכוּ וְקֹשְׁשׁוּ לָהֶם תֶּבֶן׃ 8 וְאֶת־מַתְכֹּנֶת הַלְּבֵנִים אֲשֶׁר הֵם
עֹשִׂים תְּמוֹל שִׁלְשֹׁם תָּשִׂימוּ עֲלֵיהֶם לֹא תִגְרְעוּ מִמֶּנּוּ כִּי־נִרְפִּים
הֵם עַל־כֵּן הֵם צֹעֲקִים לֵאמֹר נֵלְכָה נִזְבְּחָה לֵאלֹהֵינוּ׃ 9 תִּכְבַּד

had, probably, to keep the statistical and genealogical lists of the people, although this might not have been their principal duty. All these offices make the knowledge of writing a fundamental condition, and show that the Shoterim were not subordinate functionaries (as the lictores, viatores, apparitores, as *Fuller* believes, Misc. Sacr. iii. 19, and *Selden*, De Synedr. i. 15), but officers of a much superior rank, frequently taken from among the Levites, the most instructed part of the people (2 Chron. xix. 11; xxxiv. 13. See *Michaelis*, Mos. Recht. l. § 51; *Jahn*, Archaeology, II. i. 62; *Vater*, Pent. iii. 537; *Eichhorn*, Introd. iii. 577; *Hengstenberg*, Authent. of the Pent. ii. p. 449, *et seq.*; *Gesenius*, Thes. p. 1396; *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. ii. p. 419). It is well known, that the Egyptians had also scribes with functions similar to those of the corresponding Hebrew magistrates; and that even now the Arabic fellahs, whose position is very analogous to that of the Israelites described in our text, are treated by the Turks in the same manner. Arabic overseers have to give an account of the labours of their countrymen to the Turkish taskmasters, who often chastise them mercilessly for the real or imputed offences of the Arabic workmen (see *Rosellini*, ii. 2. p. 257, ii. 3. 218; *Wilkinson*, Eg. and Theb. i. p. 393).

7. *You shall not continue to give.* תאספון is identical with תוספון, Hiph. of יָסַף, with Nun prosentheticum. About תמול שלשם, see iv. 10.—*And gather straw* (וקששו) *for themselves;* the verb קָשַׁשׁ, from which the substantive קַשׁ stubbles (ver. 12) is derived, corresponds precisely with the German expression, *zusammenstoppeln.*—This verse describes accurately and faithfully the custom prevailing in Egypt with regard to the preparation of bricks. We have an abundance of testimonials proving the fact, that the Egyptians manufactured their bricks from clay taken from the Nile, with which they mixed straw cut into small pieces, in order to give them firmness and compactness; and after the bricks thus prepared have been dried in the sun, they are of such hardness and durability that they defy the destructive influence of millenniums, especially in dry climates like Egypt, where rain is rare; and Rosellini has recently brought some of them from Egypt, which bear the name of Thotmes IV., the fifth king of the eighteenth dynasty. On being analysed they were found to contain an admixture of straw, which is, however, the less in quantity the more carefully they are prepared, and the better the clay is of which they are made (see *Rosellini*, ii. 2. p. 252). The bricks of the first pyramid in Dashur are made of slime of the Nile, mixed with chopped straw. Philo already (De Vita Mosis, ii. p. 86) says: πλίνθου γὰρ ἄχυρα δεσμός, "straw is the tie of bricks." Lucretius Statius writes:

"Nam laterem qui ducit habet nihil amplius unquam
Quam commune lutum e paleis, coenumque aceratum;"

to which Nonius Marcellus, who quotes these words, remarks: "Aceratum est lutum paleis mistum, ut laterarii usus est." And Michaelis observes on our passage: "It must not be imagined that the straw was used for *burning* the bricks, for which, perhaps all the straw of Egypt would not have sufficed; but the clay employed for the manufacture of the

same day the taskmasters of the people and their [1]overseers, saying: 7. You shall not continue to give the people straw to make bricks, as heretofore: let them go and gather straw for themselves. 8. And the tale of the bricks, which they did make heretofore, you shall lay upon them; you shall diminish nothing thereof: for they *are* idle: therefore they cry, Let us go *and* sacrifice to our God. 9. [2]Let the work be hard upon the men, *so* that

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Officers. [2] Let there more work be laid upon.

bricks was mixed with straw in order to enhance its consistency." This is still the prevailing usage in many districts of Africa and Southern Asia. Moses nowhere speaks of *burning* bricks; and Egypt would have been unable to furnish the necessary firing materials, as that country is notorious for its scarcity of wood. Luther is therefore mistaken in translating ללבן לבנים with "Ziegel zu *brennen*" (see *Chardin*, Travels, iv. p.112; *Shaw*, Travels, p. 136; *Baumgarten*, Travels, Ch. 18; *Hasselquist*, Travels, p. 100; *Pococke*, Observations on Egypt, p. 53; *Rosenmüller*, Orient, i. 271—274.)

8. *And the tale of the bricks.* מתכנת or תֹּכֶן, ver. 18, derived from תָּכַן, to weigh, to measure (Prov. xvi. 2; xxi. 2; Isa. xl. 12, etc.), signifies quantity, fixed number, or measure. The Septuagint renders, therefore, correctly, σύνταξις; Vulgate, mensura; Rashbam, חשבון. The same amount of bricks which were imposed upon the Israelites when they were provided with straw by the royal officers were to be exacted from them now also, when they had first to seek this material themselves.—*They did make;* עשים, the participle of the present used for the past tense; see note on i. 1. תמול שלשם, is, by the Septuagint, translated freely: καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, and connected with the following words: תשימו עליהם, whilst they belong to the preceding part of the verse: אשר הם עשים —*For they are idle*; therefore, 1st. they can do more work than hitherto, and, 2nd. this is the reason why they wish to celebrate festivals. נִרְפִּים, Part. Niphil of רָפָה, to relax (iv. 26), to let down (2 Chron. xv. 7); אל ירפו ידיכם, "let not your hands hang down," that is, do not be lazy in your work. And in this latter signification the Niphal is used in our passage, and in ver. 17.

9. *Let the work be hard*, etc. Pharaoh pronounces in this verse openly and unblushingly the leading principle of his tyrannical policy, which had urged him to oppress the Israelites with rigorous and unremitting labours, and which he had already hinted at in a former remark addressed to Moses and Aaron (ver. 5); namely, that the oppressive works were intended to prevent the minds of the enslaved Hebrews from indulging in plans of deliverance, and ever remembering the favourable circumstances under which their ancestors had immigrated into Egypt, and the encouraging promises they had received from the monarch who then ruled in Egypt. This general sense of the verse being incontrovertibly clear, the signification of the only doubtful word which it contains, ואל־ישעו, cannot be difficult. שָׁעָה, either followed by אֶל (Isa. xvii. 8), or by עַל (Isa. xvii. 7, xxxi. 1), or by בְּ, as in our passage (and Psalm cxix. 16), means *to look to any one for aid;* so that the purport of the words of the king is: oppress the people with toilsome and breathless labours, entirely absorbing all their energies and their whole attention, so that they have neither the desire nor the leisure to listen to the idle words of Moses and Aaron, who flatter them with vain hopes of deliverance. We shall now be enabled to judge

הָעֲבֹדָה עַל־הָאֲנָשִׁים וְיַעֲשׂוּ־בָהּ וְאַל־יִשְׁעוּ בְּדִבְרֵי־שָׁקֶר׃
10 וַיֵּצְאוּ נֹגְשֵׂי הָעָם וְשֹׁטְרָיו וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֶל־הָעָם לֵאמֹר כֹּה
אָמַר פַּרְעֹה אֵינֶנִּי נֹתֵן לָכֶם תֶּבֶן׃ 11 אַתֶּם לְכוּ קְחוּ לָכֶם
תֶּבֶן מֵאֲשֶׁר תִּמְצָאוּ כִּי אֵין נִגְרָע מֵעֲבֹדַתְכֶם דָּבָר׃ 12 וַיָּפֶץ
הָעָם בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם לְקֹשֵׁשׁ קַשׁ לַתֶּבֶן׃ 13 וְהַנֹּגְשִׂים
אָצִים לֵאמֹר כַּלּוּ מַעֲשֵׂיכֶם דְּבַר־יוֹם בְּיוֹמוֹ כַּאֲשֶׁר בִּהְיוֹת

of the various interpretations of this verb offered by the different translators and commentators. The Septuagint renders *μὴ μεριμνάτωσαν ἐν λόγοις κενοῖς*, "they shall not meditate about, or think of idle words." So also explains Rashi: "they shall not reflect on, and speak of, vain plans," (quoting, in corroboration, Psalm cxix. 16, and rejecting here the signification which the verb שָׁעָה has in Gen. iv. 4, 5); and this interpretation has been adopted by Mendelssohn (so werden sie sich nicht mehr mit lügenhaften Worten unterhalten); and Arnheim (who translates like Mendelssohn, but proposes, at the same time, the conception of שעה ב, in the signification of חזה ב, to amuse oneself: "that they do not indulge in vain words);" and similarly Targum Onkelos, ולא יתעסקן בפתגמין בטילין, "and let them not occupy themselves with vain words." But the verb שעה in this signification of *meditating* is more Aramaic than Hebrew, and in the only passage quoted as a proof (Ps. cxix. 117), its meaning is too uncertain to be used as a basis of further conjectures.—Saadiah believes יִשְׁעוּ to be identical with יִשָּׁעֲנוּ, "and they shall not lean upon idle words," but such apocope of the נ at the end of the verb is without analogy, although the *sense* of שעה and שען is kindred. Ebn Ezra is of opinion that ישעו has the same meaning as ירפו (see the preceding verse; compare Psalm xxxix. 14; Isaiah xxii. 4); that the phrase is elliptical, ממלאכתם being omitted, and that the prefix ב in בדברי שקר signifies the cause or reason; so that the meaning of the words would be: and let them not be idle in their works on account of the vain illusions by which Moses and Aaron deceive them. It is easy to discover the artificiality of this combination.—Kimchi, lastly, explains the word שעה, here, with *to look with confidence, to hope;* and thus renders Jonathan, which interpretation approaches nearest to that given above.—The Samaritan Version has וְיִשְׁעוּ־בָהּ instead of וְיַעֲשׂוּ־בָהּ; which reading is expressed by the Septuagint, Syrian, Onkelos, Jonathan, and Saadiah; it is, however, incompatible with the true meaning of the verb שעה, whilst the accepted text implies a great emphasis.

10. *And the taskmasters...... went out,* namely, from the palace of the king to the places where the people worked. The Septuagint renders ויצאו by *κατέσπευδον* (they urged them on); as if our text were אצים as in ver. 13.—איני נתן *I shall not give;* the participle is here used in the signification of the *future*, as in Gen. xix. 13, משחיתים אנחנו, we *shall* destroy.

11. *Go you* (אתם) *take for yourselves,* (לכם), etc. The repetition of the personal pronoun (לכם — אתם) in the Hebrew text is emphatically opposed to אינני in the preceding verse.—Take .. straw *from any place, where you can find it* (מאשר תמצאו). Before the relative אשר, not only the demonstrative pronoun is omitted (which has no proper form in Hebrew), but frequently also the *time* or the *place*, especially if the relative pronoun is preceded by a preposition, as in our instance.—*Yet* (כי) *nothing shall be diminished of your work.* כי intro-

they may [1]have *fully* to do with it, and not [2]listen to vain words. 10. And the taskmasters of the people and their overseers went out, and they spoke to the people, saying, Thus [3]hath Pharaoh said: I shall not give you straw. 11. Go you, take for yourselves straw from *any place* where you can find it: yet nothing shall be diminished of your work. 12. So the people were scattered abroad throughout the land of Egypt to gather stubble instead of straw. 13. And the taskmasters urged *them*, saying, Finish your work, *your* daily tasks, as when there was

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Labour therein. [2] Regard. [3] Saith.

duces frequently adversative sentences, not only if a negation or a negative phrase precedes, but also after positive sentences, when it has the signification of *yet, however, notwithstanding this*; and in such sense it is used here. Compare especially Isaiah xxviii. 28, כי לא לנצח אדוש ידושנו "*but* he will not always thresh it," where the English Version translates *because*, which makes no sense. Less appropriate seems the explanation of Rashi, who, following the version of the Targumim, interprets: "You must gather straw *with eagerness and perseverance, for* nothing will be remitted to you from your usual work"; and this view, which is also expressed by the Septuagint, has been adopted by Mendelssohn, Rosenmüller, Cahen, and others. But it is unusual, that the very words on which the greatest stress lies, should be elliptically omitted.—אין נגרע That the form נגרע is the *participle*, and not the *present* of Niphal, is not only obvious from the Kamets in the last syllable, but also from the adverb אין, which is usually followed by the participle. This form is, therefore, here used instead of the future, like נתן in ver. 10. Compare note on iii. 2, to איננו אכל.—The word מעבדתכם is rendered by the Septuagint with ἀπὸ τῆς συντάξεως ὑμῶν like מתכנת in ver. 8, with which it is here synonymous.

12. *And the people were scattered abroad.* ויפץ (futurum Hiphil of פוץ, shortened from יפיץ or יָפֵץ, on account of the Vav conversivum) is here used in an intransitive sense (as in 1 Sam. xiii. 8: ויפץ העם מעליו "and the people dispersed from him"; see also Job xxxviii. 24), although the more usual signification of פוץ in Hiphil is transitive (Deut. iv. 27; Psalms xviii. 15, etc.). It is therefore unnecessary to translate with Ebn Ezra: "And *Pharaoh* scattered the people." About לקשש קש, see on ver. 7.—*Instead of straw* לתבן; the prefix ל has here the signification of *instead*, as in Gen. xi. 3, (והחמר היה להם לחמר, and bitumen was to them instead of mortar); see our note on iv. 16: "and he shall speak *instead of thee*" (לך). This acceptation of ל yields here a very appropriate sense. The renderings of the Septuagint (εἰς ἄχυρα), the Targumim (לְתִיבְנָא), De Wette, and Arnheim (zu Stroh) are indistinct, whilst that of the Vulgate (ad colligendas paleas) is inaccurate, and evades the difficulty.

13. *And the* (Egyptian) *taskmasters urged them*, namely, the Hebrew workmen or overseers (see ver. 14).—אוץ, originally intransitive, to be straight, tight (Josh. xvii. 15), has here the transitive signification, to urge, to insist upon, as in Hiphil (see Gen. xix. 15; Isaiah xxii. 4). Onkelos דָּחֲקִין; Sept. κατέσπευδον.—דבר יום ביומו properly "the task of every day on its day," that is, the daily task; thus the Septuagint, τὰ καθήκοντα καθ' ἡμέραν (the due task on each day).—*As when there was straw.*

הַתֶּבֶן׃ 14 וַיֻּכּוּ שֹׁטְרֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר־שָׂמוּ עֲלֵהֶם נֹגְשֵׂי
פַרְעֹה לֵאמֹר מַדּוּעַ לֹא כִלִּיתֶם חָקְכֶם לִלְבֹּן כִּתְמוֹל שִׁלְשֹׁם
גַּם־תְּמוֹל גַּם־הַיּוֹם׃ 15 וַיָּבֹאוּ שֹׁטְרֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּצְעֲקוּ אֶל־
פַּרְעֹה לֵאמֹר לָמָּה תַעֲשֶׂה כֹה לַעֲבָדֶיךָ׃ 16 תֶּבֶן אֵין נִתָּן

Onkelos, Jonathan, the Septuagint, and Vulgate, render according to the sense: "As you were used to do when straw was given to you."

14. *And the overseers of the children of Israel were beaten.* See to ver. 6. The overseers (Shoterim) being Israelites, they treated their co-religionists with consideration, not demanding of them tasks which they were physically unable to accomplish. But when the task-masters, who were Egyptians, found that the number of bricks finished by the Hebrew workmen did not reach the exorbitant amount which they had imposed upon them, the overseers were ill-treated and beaten for the indulgence evinced for their brethren. It will be known to our readers, that even at present the rule of the stick is generally prevalent in many parts of the East. Blows are the ordinary means of punishment; they are scarcely considered a degradation; they belong to the natural prerogatives of the superior; and are the most obvious emblem of his mastership. Neither rank, nor learning, nor old age can protect against the ruthless tyranny of the stick; and not unfrequently are European travellers shocked by scenes of revolting barbarism committed publicly against venerable individuals for the slightest offences, after the despotic humour of Oriental masters. לאמר *saying* (Infinitivus absolutus), being addressed in this manner, or with the following words—*Wherefore have you not finished your task* (חקכם)? i.e., Why did not you take care that the workmen under your control finished the quantity of bricks ordered to them? חק, that which is prescribed or fixed; the German translation, "euren *Satz* Ziegel" expresses well the etymology. See Prov. xxx. 8; xxxi. 15. Compare the drawing of Rosellini alluded to in our note to i. 14. The words כתמל שלשם, signify, *as heretofore* or *hitherto* (see on iv. 10; not necessarily "the day before yesterday," as Rashi here remarks); תמל is simply yesterday; and therefore the sense of the whole phrase amounts to this: Wherefore have you not finished your *usual* task, *neither yesterday nor to-day?* To which Ebn Ezra observes, that the people neglected their work on the day when Moses performed the three signs before them (iv. 30), nor could they finish their task on the following day, when after the interview of Moses and Aaron with Pharaoh (ver. 6), they were ordered to furnish the same amount of bricks, without straw being given to them. The Targumim and the Septuagint translate more freely, urging too much the etymological meaning of שלשם as *the third day.*

15. The kings of Egypt probably held on certain days a sort of open court or divan, as usual in Oriental monarchies, when every subject was allowed to appear to seek justice or to claim redress; and thus the Hebrew overseers had free access to the royal ear, and opportunities were afforded to them to represent to Pharaoh their grievances and oppressions, the responsibilities for which, therefore, if left without alteration or remedy, fell with still greater weight on the conscience of the tyrannical king.

16. ולבנים אמרים לנו עשו *And they say to us, Make bricks*; the construction is an inversion or *hypallage.* The regular order of the words would be אמרים לנו עשו לבנים (compare ver. 8). To אמרים the word הנגשים is to be supplied as subject. The participle is sometimes used instead of the third person; which is the case

straw. 14. And the overseers of the children of Israel whom Pharaoh's taskmasters had set over them, were beaten [1] with the words, Wherefore have you not finished your task in making bricks as heretofore, both yesterday and to-day? 15. Then the overseers of the children of Israel came and cried to Pharaoh, saying, Wherefore dealest thou thus with thy servants? 16. There is no straw given to thy servants; and they say to us, Make

[1] *Engl. Vers.—And* demanded.

with אמרים, in Gen. xxxvii. 17, also.—*And behold, thy servants are beaten; but thy people sins* (וחטאת עמך). These two Hebrew words, which have given rise to a multiplicity of conflicting versions and interpretations, appear to imply a hidden and modest hint on the part of the Hebrew overseers, that the arbitrary and tyrannical conduct of the Egyptian task-masters — who are here identified with the whole Egyptian nation, and who are, in fact, but the instruments of the despotic commands of the king — will ultimately call down upon them the just chastisement of the deity, under whose immediate protection the oppressed people stands. The German translation: "aber dein Volk *versündigt* sich," corresponds admirably with the Hebrew text, and is in accordance with the interpretation here offered. חטאת is the third person feminine of the preterit of Kal, instead of חטאה, as sometimes the verbs ל״א harden the ה into ת; so קראת, instead of קראה (Isaiah vii. 14); נפלאת instead of נפלאה (Psalms cxviii. 23); הבאת instead of הובאה, (Gen. xxxiii. 11). The substantive עם, being a collective noun, is construed with the feminine, according to a peculiarity of the Hebrew idiom, which logically considers collective nouns as abstract notions. Targum Jonathan nearly expresses the sense as explained above: "And the sin of thy people is great and heavy"; and, with unimportant modifications, Ebn Ezra, Rosenmüller, and De Wette; and Paterson paraphrases: "but the guilt of this oppression and tyranny will be charged on thy own people." The Septuagint, however, translates: ἀδικήσεις οὖν τὸν λαόν σου, "thou wrongest thy people," as if the Hebrew text were וחטאת לעמך, so that עמך would refer to the Israelites, not the Egyptians. And so also the Syrian version. But against such interpretation militates: 1. the adopted text; 2. the disrespect and impropriety which would be implied in such almost impertinent language used in the face of the king; and 3. the apparent antithesis of עבדיך *thy servants*, and עמך *thy people*, which would be destroyed by referring the latter to the Israelites. Some have very improperly thus explained that antithesis: "*we* (the overseers) are punished, whilst the *people* are the offenders"; for it was certainly not the intention of the Hebrew overseers to throw the fault upon their unfortunate brethren, with whose misery they so deeply sympathised. The Vulgate in rendering: "et injuste agitur contra populum tuum," mitigates the second, without obviating the other two objections. Rashi explains: "And this conduct brings sin over thy people"; which sense it would be difficult grammatically to deduce from the Hebrew text (neither חטאת nor עמך are thus easily explicable). Mendelssohn and Arnheim translate: "And thy people is treated like offenders," which explanation is also given by Clericus (quasi populus tuus deliquisset plectimur, vel: fit reus peccati; imputatur ei peccatum); and Glaire (et que ton peuple est traité en coupable); but these versions and explanations

לַעֲבָדֶיךָ וּלְבֵנִים אֹמְרִים לָנוּ עֲשׂוּ וְהִנֵּה עֲבָדֶיךָ מֻכִּים וְחָטָאת
עַמֶּךָ׃ 17 וַיֹּאמֶר נִרְפִּים אַתֶּם נִרְפִּים עַל־כֵּן אַתֶּם אֹמְרִים
נֵלְכָה נִזְבְּחָה לַיהוָה׃ 18 וְעַתָּה לְכוּ עִבְדוּ וְתֶבֶן לֹא־יִנָּתֵן
לָכֶם וְתֹכֶן לְבֵנִים תִּתֵּנוּ׃ 19 וַיִּרְאוּ שֹׁטְרֵי בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֹתָם
בְּרָע לֵאמֹר לֹא־תִגְרְעוּ מִלִּבְנֵיכֶם דְּבַר־יוֹם בְּיוֹמוֹ׃ 20 וַיִּפְגְּעוּ
אֶת־מֹשֶׁה וְאֶת־אַהֲרֹן נִצָּבִים לִקְרָאתָם בְּצֵאתָם מֵאֵת פַּרְעֹה׃
21 וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֲלֵהֶם יֵרֶא יְהוָה עֲלֵיכֶם וְיִשְׁפֹּט אֲשֶׁר הִבְאַשְׁתֶּם

seem to be also framed with disregard of the original phrase; *to sin* and *to be treated as a sinner*, are two very different notions, which it is impossible to ascribe to the same word without conclusive proofs. The rendering in Zunz's Bible is unintelligible ("und es fehlt deinem Volke"). The exposition of Abarbanel, that the Hebrew overseers went to Pharaoh, believing that the task-masters acted so rigourously from their own arbitrariness and against the will and knowledge of the king, so that they said to him: "thy people—that is, thy task-masters—sin, not thyself"; this exposition, sagacious as it is, militates against ver. 6, according to which the new edict was pronounced by the king to the task-masters in the presence of the overseers; although, as we have observed above, it is not improper to designate the taskmasters as *the people* of Egypt.

17. The same commentator finds in the emphatical repetition of the word *idle* (see to ver. 8) an allusion to the fact, that in the opinion of Pharaoh the Hebrews had no right to complain of this aggravation of their labours, as they had only to furnish the same quantity of bricks as heretofore, although they had lately so considerably increased; so that if straw were provided to them as before, they would have too much leisure to think of idle hopes and dangerous schemes. However, this argument is fallacious, as, no doubt, the same amount of bricks was not imposed upon the Israelites *collectively* but *individually*: and thus the new measure affected them most grievously.

18. *Go therefore now, and work.* This command is obviously addressed to the overseers, who probably not only exercised the supervision over the Hebrew labourers, but were also obliged to employ the time which was unoccupied by that ungrateful office, with the same degrading works under which their brethren sighed.

19. *And the overseers of the children of Israel saw that they were in an evil position.* As the overseers were directly responsible to the task-masters for the execution of the tasks imposed upon the Hebrew workmen (see ver. 14), every new severity of the king affected them even more immediately than the Israelitish people; and nothing was left them but the melancholy privilege of retaliating against their own co-religionists the abuses they had endured themselves, a privilege, from the exercise of which they had the more reason to abstain, as they were themselves perfectly convinced of the utter incapability of the workmen to satisfy the heartless command of the king. We take, therefore, the pronoun אֹתָם here in the reflective signification: the overseers saw *themselves* in a lamentable condition; which implies an affecting feature in the conduct of the overseers, who in their embarassing dilemma, preferred leniency towards their brethren to the selfish attempt of avoiding the royal wrath. Less acceptable, is, therefore, the opinion of those who refer אתם

bricks: and, behold, thy servants *are* beaten; [1]but thy
people sins. 17. But he said, You *are* idle, *you are* idle:
therefore you say, Let us go *and* sacrifice to the Lord.
18. Go therefore now, *and* work; for there shall no straw
be given to you, yet shall you deliver the tale of bricks.
19. And the overseers of the children of Israel saw *that*
they *were* in an evil *position*, since it was said, You shall
diminish nothing from your bricks of your daily task.
20. And they met Moses and Aaron, who stood in their
way, when they came from Pharaoh. 21. And they said
to them, The Lord may look upon you, and judge; because
you have made our odour to be abhorred in the eyes of
Pharaoh, and in the eyes of his servants, to put a sword

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—But the fault is in thine own people.

to the *workmen*, at whose deplorable fate the overseers were especially grieved. About the use of the suffixes as reflective pronouns, compare 1 Sam. iii. 13. Ezekiel xxxiv. 8. Luther and De Wette translate indistinctly, ("dass es ärger ward"; "dass sie übel daran seien"). Gerlach, no doubt following Fagius, who misunderstands the rendering of Onkelos, explains: "and the overseers of the children of Israel looked upon them with severity, in order to terrify them and to stimulate them the more to finish the prescribed number of bricks"—which interpretation, not only not harmonizes with the context, but militates against the Hebrew words: for אתם would be superfluous, and רע, without further addition, does not mean severity. Abarbanel carrying out his doubtful conception of this whole passage (see ver. 16), explains: "Now were the overseers convinced that *they*, i. e., the task-masters *and* the king were in unison in these tyrannical measures."—לאמר. Mendelssohn translates here: "da sie sagen mussten"; see on ver. 14.

20. *And they* (namely, the overseers, and not, as Rashi supplies, some Israelites) *met Moses and Aaron.* Luther inverts unnecessarily this verse entirely, translating: "Und da sie von Pharaoh gingen, begegneten sie Mose und Aron, und traten gegen sie."

21. *The Lord may look upon you* (ירא) *and judge.* ראה followed by עַל signifies to look upon any one, to examine his cause. Onkelos renders ירא (which is the apocapated future tense of Kal of ראה) with *the Lord may appear to you* (יתגלי), as if it were the Niphal form יֵרָאֶה—*Because you have made our odour to be abhorred in the eyes of Pharaoh*, i. e., you have made us hateful, odious in the eyes of Pharaoh. באש, to have a bad smell, to be fetid, seems not quite adapted in connection with *the eyes*; however, in Hebrew, the five senses are sometimes promiscuously used without that nice distinction which modern languages observe in this respect; for instance, "*Truly the light is sweet*" (ומתוק האור, Eccles. xii. 7), or, "all the people *saw the thunderings*" (ראים את הקולת Exod. xx. 15). In primitive languages, in which imagination prevails over reflection, the metaphors are not unfrequently accumulated to such a degree that they sometimes destroy each other; but what the expressions thus lose in logic, they usually gain in force and richness. Such irregularity of diction is, therefore, not unfrequent in original minds, and Shakespeare's works abound in it; for instance, Hamlet speaks

אֶת־רֵיחֵנוּ בְּעֵינֵי פַרְעֹה וּבְעֵינֵי עֲבָדָיו לָתֶת־חֶרֶב בְּיָדָם לְהָרְגֵנוּ׃
מפטיר 22 וַיָּשָׁב מֹשֶׁה אֶל־יְהוָה וַיֹּאמַר אֲדֹנָי לָמָה הֲרֵעֹתָה
לָעָם הַזֶּה לָמָּה זֶּה שְׁלַחְתָּנִי׃ 23 וּמֵאָז בָּאתִי אֶל־פַּרְעֹה
לְדַבֵּר בִּשְׁמֶךָ הֵרַע לָעָם הַזֶּה וְהַצֵּל לֹא־הִצַּלְתָּ אֶת־עַמֶּךָ׃

of "*taking arms* against a *sea* of troubles" (iii. 1). Besides our phrase belongs to those, in which the original figurative sense of the verb has, by frequent use, become obliterated, so that, in the course of time, it was reduced to the general meaning of: *to make odious*, without simultaneously calling forth the notion of bad odour (compare the German verb anrüchig werden).—*To put a sword into their hand to slay us*, that is, to make us suspected in their eyes; to furnish them with a pretext for increased rigour against us, whom they believe to have conspired against their legitimate sovereign for our violent deliverance.

22. How could Moses be surprised at the obstinacy of Pharaoh, and complain so despondingly, as God had distinctly predicted to him that the Egyptian despot would not allow the Israelites to leave the land before He had displayed His might and His wonders against him (iii. 19)? But Moses recalled to his mind with greater force such promises of God as: "I have seen the affliction of my people in Egypt, and have heard their cry about their taskmasters" (iii. 7), or, "the cry of the children of Israel is come to me, and I have also seen the oppression wherewith the Egyptians oppress them" (ver. 9), plainly expressive of an alleviation of their burthens. And, therefore, he was not prepared to offer a satisfactory reply to the Hebrew overseers. Nachmanides, who raises the same question, answers it by the supposition, that Moses had expected, God would, immediately after the first insolent expressions of Pharaoh, strike him with all His plagues and punishments; and that the impatient

ו 1 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה עַתָּה תִרְאֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶעֱשֶׂה לְפַרְעֹה כִּי
בְיָד חֲזָקָה יְשַׁלְּחֵם וּבְיָד חֲזָקָה יְגָרְשֵׁם מֵאַרְצוֹ׃

CHAPTERS VI. 1 to VII. 7.

Summary.—Before inflicting upon Pharaoh the chastisements provoked by his despotic and impious refractoriness, God reveals Himself to Moses in new and solemn communications, under the holy attributes of *the Eternal and Immutable Being*, and promises the redemption of Israel from Egypt, and their conquest of Palestine: 1, by virtue of those attributes (see ver. 1); 2, on account of the covenant concluded with the patriarchs; and, 3, in consequence of Pharaoh's tyranny, now carried to a revolting degree (ver. 2—8).—Moses reports these repeated divine assurances to the people, who, however, by the excess of their oppression, had despairingly resigned every hope, and now scarcely listened to the consoling words of Moses (ver. 9). But God re-iterates His commands to Moses, although the latter raises again the objection concerning his deficiency of speech (ver. 10—13; 28—30; vii. 1—7).—Before, however, Moses and Aaron enter upon their important mission, it was thought expedient to exhibit their descent from, and connection with, the family of Jacob; and therefore the genealogy of the three tribes of Reuben, Simeon, and Levi is here inserted (ver. 14—27), with a more detailed description of the family of Levi, among the members of which, again, Moses and Aaron are singled out with particular stress (ver. 26, 27).

1. *For by a strong hand will he send them away*, that is, compelled by the judgments and visitations of God will Pharaoh not only allow but precipitate

into their hand to slay us. 22. And Moses returned to the Lord, and said, Lord, wherefore hast thou done *so* evil to this people? wherefore *is* it *that* thou hast sent me? 23. For since I came to Pharaoh to speak in Thy name, he hath done evil to this people; nor hast Thou in any way delivered Thy people.

messenger could not understand or appreciate this long-suffering delay of the eternal judge, who evidently wished to afford abundant time for the hardened tyrant to repent, and to listen to the better dictates of his conscience. We repeat, that the desponding complaint of Moses was not the result of disbelief or doubt, but the effort of a pious soul struggling after a deeper penetration into the mysteries of the Almighty—who far from condemning such fluctuations of the "deceitful heart"—looks with indulgence on human weakness and short-sightedness (see vi. 1).—*Wherefore is it that thou hast sent me.* The demonstrative pronoun זֶה is pleonastically added after certain particles of interrogation and explanation, as לָמָּה (Gen. xviii. 13), מַה (Gen. xxvii. 20), הִנֵּה, like *tandem* in Latin, *ποτέ* in Greek, and لماذا in Arabic. It is obvious, that זה so used increases the force of the question, for it implies an emphatical ellipsis, as will appear from our translation in this instance, compared with: "Wherefore hast thou sent me," as the sentence would be without זה.

23. *For since I came*, ומאז באתי. מאז is here used as a conjunction instead of מאז אשׁר (like Gen. xxxix. 5. Exod. ix, 24), whilst in other passages (Exod. iv. 10), it is construed with the infinitive like a preposition.—Only when the obstinacy of Pharaoh, and the misery of the people of Israel had reached the highest gradation, God proceeded to chastise the one, and to alleviate the other.

CHAP. VI. 1. Then the Lord said to Moses, Now shalt thou see what I shall do to Pharaoh; for [1]by a strong hand will he send them away, and [1]by a strong hand will he drive them out of his land.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—With.

the departure of the Israelites. This explanation, offered by Rashi (מפני ידי חזקה), and adopted by Rashbam, Rosenmüller, De Wette, Zunz, Arnheim and Gerlach, and expressed also by the Vulgate, Luther and Patterson, "constrained by an overmastering force," is by far preferable to the indistinct rendering of the Septuagint, Arabic, Mendelssohn, and the English Version: "*with* a strong hand he will send them away," which would convey a perfectly incorrect notion. ביד חזקה is, the second time, rendered by the Septuagint, and the Arabic, as if the Hebrew text were בזרוע נטויה (the former translating: *ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ*, the latter وذراع رفيع) About this expression see note on iii. 19.

2, 3. The demands which Moses had addressed to Pharaoh, had produced the alarming result of a still more rigorous and cruel treatment of the Israelites. Moses, naturally desponding and without boldness or self-assurance, was still more intimidated by the reproaches with which he was assailed both by the king (ver. 4) and the people (ver. 21), and in

ס ס ס

2 וַיְדַבֵּר אֱלֹהִים אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו אֲנִי יְהוָה׃ 3 וָאֵרָא
אֶל־אַבְרָהָם אֶל־יִצְחָק וְאֶל־יַעֲקֹב בְּאֵל שַׁדָּי וּשְׁמִי יְהוָה לֹא

this oppressed and isolated position, in which national and personal grief mingled in his patriotic and sensitive heart, he asked God, in humility, why He had ordered him to appear before Pharaoh, if it was not His intention to bless his mission with success. Now, therefore, when the tyrannical obstinacy of the king made the long threatened punishments and plagues unavoidable, even for the long-suffering of God, the appropriate moment had come to fill Moses anew with confidence and firmness of resolution, which were henceforth but rarely to forsake him in extraordinary trials; and to reveal to him the hitherto misunderstood and unappreciated awful divine attributes, which described Him as both willing and competent to rescue the Israelites. Whilst the patriarchs had known God only under the name of the Omnipotent, the all-powerful Being (אל שדי, Gen. xvii. 1; xxviii. 3, etc.); the Creator of heaven and earth (Gen. xiv. 19); and the Ruler of *nature*, and the *natural* destinies of man, which, however, does not exclude many miraculous events; and although the sacred name of God (יהוה) was already *mentioned* to them (Gen. xv. 7; xxii. 14; xxviii. 13, etc.); yet the true and deep purport of this designation (שֵׁם), was not *understood* and comprehended by them (נודע). This important revelation, which Moses received already when God appeared to him for the first time (iii. 14, 15, see our notes), namely, that God is *eternal and immutable*, that therefore all His promises, if they even embrace centuries and millenniums, are unfailingly realized in due season; and that the assurances given to Abraham concerning the ultimate glorious redemption of the oppressed Israelites from Egypt (Gen. xv. 14) are likewise on the point of being fulfilled: this revelation is now, for the first time, to be communicated to, and spread among, the Israelites; it is to strengthen their hopes, to erect them in their dejection, and, finally to contribute to the perpetual glorification of God, who, by the deliverance of Israel (ver. 6), and their conquest of Canaan (ver. 8), will be recognised not only as all-powerful, but also immutable in His designs and promises. The knowledge of the name יהוה was, henceforth, not the exclusive privilege of a few favoured individuals, but it became the designation of the national God of Israel, the appellation of the God of the eternal covenant. What had been a dim craving to the patriarchs, was now raised to a clear conviction in the mind of even the lowest of the people; time had worked its enlightening influence, and in the school of misery, the religious feeling had been matured into an intellectual knowledge. Thus had Israel acquired the first and primary condition of its august mission as instructor of the world; and from the conscious knowledge of the Eternal and Immutable, to the proclamation of the Decalogue was but one step.—The derivation of שדי is doubtful; the rabbinical explanation אשר די, self-sufficient, *αὐτάρκης*, *ἱκανός*, is the least acceptable. Ebn Ezra (and after him *Ewald*, Gr. § 155. *c*. *Tuch*, ad Gen. xvii. 1, and others) supposes שדי to be derived from שדה = שדד, like דָּנִי from דָּוָה. But this analogy would require שָׁדִי, the second vowel being unchangeably long in the form קָטָל; قتال. Gesenius (Gr. § 86, 1. *b*.), like Vitringa, De Dieu, and others, believes שדי to be the *pluralis majestatis* of שַׁד, powerful; but the termination ־ַי for the plural is too uncertain to warrant such conjecture (for שרי in Judges v. 15, is disputed). It appears that שַׁדַּי is the plural of שַׁד, with the suffix of the first person, like אֲדֹנָי, as it was originally

2. And God spoke to Moses, and said to him, I *am* the Lord. 3. And I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, by *the name of* God Almighty, but by my name

used in prayers and invocations addressed to the Deity. However, the *signification* of שַׁדַּי is certain beyond dispute; it is translated by the Septuagint, in Job, *παντοκράτωρ*, all-powerful; by Aquila, *ἄλκιμος*; the Vulgate, omnipotens, etc.; so that it is almost synonymous with עִזּוּז, גִּבּוֹר, אֲבִיר יַעֲקֹב (see Job xxxvii. 23; Psalm lxxxix. 9. etc.)—And I appeared *by the name of God Almighty*, באל שדי. The prefix ב denotes, sometimes, the circumstance of which something consists; it corresponds with the Latin *tamquam*, and the French *en*, and was, by the ancient grammarians, called ב *essentiae*. It is not improper to understand the ב in באל here, in this manner (compare Isa. xl. 10; Eccles. vii. 14). However, it appears more appropriate to suppose here the ellipsis, "with the name of God Almighty," by way of a kind of attraction caused by שמי immediately following; just as Ebn Ezra, and after him most of the interpreters, considers, though erroneously, שמי used instead of בשמי, the prefix ב being supplied from the preceding באל. But it seems more plausible, that as שמי יי׳ is the most important notion of the sentence, on which the greatest stress rests, it is emphatically placed at the beginning as a nominativus absolutus ("but as to my name, the Eternal") and that the demonstrative בו, which would be regularly required after להם, has been omitted. Such constructions are not unfrequent; quite analogous to our passage is Prov. xxvii. 7. ונפש רעבה כל מר מתוק "as to a hungry soul—everything bitter seems sweet *to it*," where the dative (לה) is also omitted. Compare Psalm cxv. 17; Isa. ii. 18. etc. Hence it is clear that the translation of נודעתי as a transitive verb "I have made known," like הודעתי (as the Septuagint *οὐκ ἐδήλωσα αὐτοῖς*; Vulgate indicavi) is erroneous. Saadiah supplies לבדו after להם, "but under my name, the Eternal *alone* (exclusively) I have not been known to them, but promiscuously, by יהוה, and God Almighty," which opinion has already been refuted by Ebn Ezra, who justly rejects the opinion of those also, who assert, that the name יהוה was, in fact, never used in the time of the patriarchs, but that Moses introduced it in some passages of Genesis as a name most familiar to himself; but this is impossible, in Gen. xv. 7; xxii. 16, and xxviii. 13, where God Himself speaks under that holy name; and in Gen. xxii. 14, where Abraham uses it. And yet is this opinion repeated by Philippson: "The use of the holy name of God, in Genesis, is to be ascribed to the author." The only possible explanation is that already alluded to: "My name יהוה has not been *understood* and *comprehended* by the patriarchs in its essence and depth, although it was, even in their time, already occasionally mentioned." Ebn Ezra, coinciding almost literally with the author of Cusari (ii. 2.), says, that certainly the name יהוה was already known to the patriarchs, but only as an uncomprehended and unmeaning proper noun (שם העצם), but not as a descriptive appellative noun (שם התאר), indicative of the attributes and qualities of God.—It is manifest that Moses, in being initiated in the holy and comprehensive name of the Deity, obtains a superiority over the patriarchs, who, although perhaps from the beginning more believing than the long-wavering Moses, lived more in the sphere of innocent childlike obedience than of manly spiritual enlightenment. The lawgiver was considered as the greatest prophet before and after him (Deut. xxiv. 10; compare *Maimonides*, Mor. ii. 35; Mishna, Sanhedr. xi; Hilch. Jesod. Hath. 5—8; Midr. Schem. Rabb. fol. 96. *b*.). Mendelssohn translates, or rather, paraphrases, aptly: "but with

נוֹדַעְתִּי לָהֶם׃ 4 וְגַם הֲקִמֹתִי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי אִתָּם לָתֵת לָהֶם
אֶת־אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן אֵת אֶרֶץ מְגֻרֵיהֶם אֲשֶׁר־גָּרוּ בָהּ׃ 5 וְגַם ׀ אֲנִי
שָׁמַעְתִּי אֶת־נַאֲקַת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר מִצְרַיִם מַעֲבִדִים אֹתָם
וָאֶזְכֹּר אֶת־בְּרִיתִי׃ 6 לָכֵן אֱמֹר לִבְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲנִי יְהוָה
וְהוֹצֵאתִי אֶתְכֶם מִתַּחַת סִבְלֹת מִצְרַיִם וְהִצַּלְתִּי אֶתְכֶם מֵעֲבֹדָתָם
וְגָאַלְתִּי אֶתְכֶם בִּזְרוֹעַ נְטוּיָה וּבִשְׁפָטִים גְּדֹלִים׃ 7 וְלָקַחְתִּי

my nature, which is infinite and all-powerful, I have not been understood (*erkannt*) by them;" Rashi: "I have not been known with my true attributes;" and still more explicitly, Abarbanel: "I was not known and understood by them with the name יהוה, although I appeared to them under that appellation; because they received their revelations not face to face, but through other mediums." And certainly a name of God, already, in some respects, though indistinctly, familiar to the Israelites, must have inspired them with far more confidence in His identity than a designation totally strange to them.

4. *To give them the land of Canaan.* These promises were made to each patriarch separately, to Abraham in Gen. xvii. 7, 8; to Isaac, in xxvi. 3, and to Jacob, in xxxv. 12.—*The land of their sojourns, wherein they sojourned.* Canaan was, to the fathers, only the land of their temporary abode, in which they resided as strangers, but which was promised to their descendants as a hereditary and permanent possession. Abarbanel urges this addition, explaining: "they were but *strangers* in Canaan, and thus the promise of God was not yet fulfilled, although they found there, for a time, a hospitable reception."—מגורים, being derived from גור, to sojourn, with the מ locale, is better to be translated in conformity with this etymology, than, as the English Version offers, "their pilgrimage wherein they were strangers."

5. I am unchangeable and my plans are unalterable (ver. 3); I have promised to your ancestors the possession of Canaan after a certain time of trial and misery (ver. 4, and Gen. xv. 16); this period of oppression is now drawing near its close (ver. 5); and I shall, therefore, fulfil my promise by rescuing you, with great judgments, from your oppressors (ver. 6, *et seq.*). This is the context of our passage.—*And I have remembered my covenant*, namely, made with Abraham, concerning the slavery and ultimate deliverance of his progeny (Gen. xv. 13—16). Ebn Ezra finds in the words: *And I have heard the groaning* (נאקת) *of the children of Israel*, an allusion, that the Israelites now repented, abandoned their idolatrous worship, and addressed their pious prayers to the God of their fathers. This interpretation is as little justified by the context as that of Abarbanel, who believes that the phrase: *I have remembered my covenant*, does not apply to the promise made to their ancestors, but describes God as the judge of mankind, who is resolved to persecute the despotic king with just afflictions.

6. *Wherefore* (לכן introducing the conclusion necessarily and naturally derivable from the antecedent facts, vers. 3, 4, 5; the reading of the Sept. לֵךְ, *βάδιζον*, is therefore erroneous), *say to the children of Israel, I am the Eternal*, that is, I am unshaken in my designs; I promise and fulfil (ver. 3), and I shall redeem you from your bondage with a stretched out arm (בזרוע נטויה), and *with great judgments* (שְׁפָטִים plural of שֶׁפֶט judgment, with the modified signification of punishment, see וְיִשְׁפֹּט in v. 21; Sept. *κρίσει μεγάλῃ*, and in vii. 4: *ἐκδικήσει μεγάλῃ*).—The forms והוצאתי

[1]the Eternal was I not known to them. 4. And I have also established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their [2]sojourns wherein they sojourned. 5. And I have also heard the groaning of the children of Israel, whom the Egyptians keep in bondage, and I have remembered my covenant. 6. Wherefore say to the children of Israel, I *am* [1]the Eternal, and I shall bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I shall rescue you out of their bondage, and I shall redeem you with a stretched-out arm, and with great judgments: 7. And I shall take you to me for a people, and I shall be to you a God: and you shall know that I

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—The Lord. [2] Pilgrimage wherein they were strangers.

והצלתי, etc., have the signification of future tenses, on account of the ו conversivum prefixed to them. The opinion of Cahen, therefore, that they are preterits, used as futures according to prophetical phraseology, is untenable.—The three parts of our verse, beginning with והוצאתי, והצלתי and וגאלתי, convey nearly equivalent ideas; we reject therefore the artificial distinctions introduced by some interpreters.

7. *And I will take you to me for a people*, namely, by the legislation of Mount Sinai, by which Israel became the *chosen people* (עם סגלה, xix. 5), or *the first-born son of God* (בן בכור iv. 22); and this was the higher spiritual end of Israel's deliverance from their physical bondage; and therefore the redemption from Egypt is almost constantly brought into connection with the most important laws of the Pentateuch, even in the Decalogue. Those words will by no unbiassed critic be considered as expressing haughtiness, assumption, or exclusive spirit on the part of the Israelites, but merely containing the undeniable historical fact, that they were the first and earliest worshippers of the true God, whose adoration they were so far from guarding with jealous particularism, that its propagation among all the nations of the earth belonged to the most enthusiastic hopes and the most fondly cherished wishes of the Hebrew prophets (see Isaiah xix. 24, 25; Zechar. xiv. 10). We declare here once for all positively, that expressions like *God of the Hebrews*, do in no way justify us to suppose, that according to Biblical notions, the dominion of God was limited to that people, whilst the other countries had their own, although less powerful deities. This opinion, which would "convert the monotheism into monolatry," has even been repeated by Bohlen, who asserts, that יהוה looked upon the other gods as his equals in essence, although he combated them as his antagonists, and considered them less powerful than himself, as indeed every nation believes its own deity to be the mightiest. To refute this opinion, it is sufficient to point to the designations with which the other gods are mentioned in the Bible; they are called אלילים (Lev. xix. 4) *nothings, non-entities*; הבלים, (Deut. xxxii. 21), *idle productions of the imagination*; even with so severe a name as גלולים (Lev. xxvi. 30; Deut. xxix. 16), *abominations*, often coupled with the synonymous terms: שקוצים (Deut. xxix. 16), and תועבות (Ezekiel xvi. 36). Are such *nonentities* "equals in essence" to the "God of Israel," the *Creator of heaven and earth* (Gen. i.), *the Judge of the whole earth* (Gen. xviii. 25), *the God of the*

אֶתְכֶם לִי לְעָם וְהָיִיתִי לָכֶם לֵאלֹהִים וִידַעְתֶּם כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה
אֱלֹהֵיכֶם הַמּוֹצִיא אֶתְכֶם מִתַּחַת סִבְלוֹת מִצְרָיִם׃ 8 וְהֵבֵאתִי
אֶתְכֶם אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נָשָׂאתִי אֶת־יָדִי לָתֵת אֹתָהּ לְאַבְרָהָם
לְיִצְחָק וּלְיַעֲקֹב וְנָתַתִּי אֹתָהּ לָכֶם מוֹרָשָׁה אֲנִי יְהוָה׃ 9 וַיְדַבֵּר
מֹשֶׁה כֵּן אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלֹא שָׁמְעוּ אֶל־מֹשֶׁה מִקֹּצֶר רוּחַ
וּמֵעֲבֹדָה קָשָׁה׃ פ
10 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 11 בֹּא דַבֵּר אֶל־פַּרְעֹה

spirits of all flesh (Num. xvi. 22), to whom ***belong the heavens and the heavens of heavens, the earth and all that is upon it*** (Deut. x. 14)? He fills the universe; and His spirit pervades so entirely all space and time, that scarcely a sphere of existence, much less a sphere of action, is left to the pagan gods. Compare also our notes on xix. 3—6.

8. אשר נשאתי וכ׳, literally: I have lifted up my hand to give it (the land), i. e., I have sworn; for it is an ancient and far spread custom—here also anthropomorphistically attributed to God—to swear by raising the hand, as if to invoke heaven as a witness of the truth of the assertions (Compare Num. xiv. 30; Deut. xxxii. 40). This oath of God securing the land of Canaan to the descendants of Abraham is related in Gen. xxii. 16—18, beginning with: ***I swear by myself, saith the Lord.*** The Septuagint, Vulgate, and nearly all the modern interpreters, translate our passage literally (*ἐφ' ἣν ἐξέτεινα τὴν χεῖρά μου*, supra quam levavi manum meam). Targum Onkelos and Jonathan more distinctly: "I have sworn by my essence."—***And I shall give it you for an heritage*** (מורשה property, from ירש to possess), not merely as a land of sojourning, as it was to your ancestors, who were strangers therein (see ver. 4), or like your abodes in Egypt, the sovereignty of which belongs to a prince of another nation. The whole solemn address of God, in which the past promises are most lucidly combined with the present misery and the future glory, and which forms, therefore, the transition to a new epoch in the history of Israel, concludes emphatically with the repeated exclamation: "***I am the Eternal***" (אני יהוה), which includes these three epochs in its deep and significant import.

9. ***But they hearkened not to Moses.*** At his first message (iv. 31), they received Moses joyfully and showed confidence in his promises; but now, when they suffered still severer hardships than before, they turned away from him; they neither listened to him, nor accepted the consolation offered to them.—***Through shortness of breath*** (מקצר רוח). This literal translation (which is also given by Rashi, the Vulgate, Mendelssohn, Rosenmüller, Salomon, and others), appears to be better adapted here than the more figurative rendering of the Septuagint by ***pusillanimity*** (*ὀλιγοψυχία*; so Zunz: Kleinmuth), or De Wette, Philippson, Arnheim, and others by ***impatience*** (Ungeduld); compare Num. xxi. 4; Judg. x. 16; Job xxi. 4; or of the English Version by "Anguish of spirit" (similarly Luther, "vor Seufzen und Angst"). Abarbanel also finds in these words the sufferings and grief of the soul, as in the following phrase: "through hard bondage" the torments of the body. (The same commentator ingeniously observes, that the holy text does not say לא האמינו (see iv. 31), but only לא שמעו they did not listen; so also in ver. 12). The words, ***and through hard bondage*** are added to מקצר רוח as an explanation, according to the Hebraism already noticed on iv. 12, to illus-

am [1]the Eternal your God, who bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians. 8. And I shall bring you into the land, concerning which I swore to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob; and I shall give it you for an heritage: I *am* [1]the Eternal. 9. And Moses spoke so to the children of Israel: but they hearkened not to Moses, [2]through shortness of breath and through hard bondage.—10. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 11. Go, speak to Pharaoh, king of Egypt, that he let

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—The Lord. [2] For anguish of spirit, and for cruel bondage.

trate difficult or ambiguous words by easier and more unmistakeable expressions connected with the preceding phrase by ו copulativum. Arnheim takes both phrases as a Hendiadys instead of "through impatience at the hard bondage." — The minds of the Israelites were in such a state of sad despondency, so exhausted and worn out, that they had yielded to a torpid resignation, and an obtuse indifference to their fate, so that even tidings of hope had not the power to stir and animate their apathetic indolence. So perfectly had the Egyptian despot gained his end! (v. 4, 5, 8).

10. It cannot be denied that the following part of this chapter, and the beginning of the following to ver. 7, is so obscure in its internal connection and structure, that the often repeated assertion, that we have here incoherent fragments unskilfully inserted in the context, appears, at the first glance, not without foundation. For neither contain ver. 11—13, and ver. 26 to vii. 7, any new information, nor does the genealogy (ver. 14—25) seem in its proper place here; this whole long passage appears, on the contrary, only to interrupt the tenor of the narrative, which would, most appropriately, from the emphatical declaration of God (ver. 2—8) have passed over to the miracles and punishments leading to the Exodus of the Israelites. — However, as to the genealogy, it is obvious that as Moses and Aaron were now on the point of executing their important mission to Pharaoh, and as here the more memorable era in their lives begins, it was expedient to delineate their descent, and to show in what way and degree they are connected with the family of Jacob. Moreover, genealogical accounts are the easiest and most natural thread for the connection of historical events separated by centuries, and are, especially in Oriental historiography, considered as an essential part (see note on ver. 16). Nor can it, from this point of view, surprise that the genealogy includes only the three tribes of Reuben, Simeon, and Levi, and that the former two are but briefly treated; since it was only neccssary to show, that Levi was the *third* son of Jacob.— The contents of ver. 11—13 are repeated in ver. 28—30, in order to resume the narrative, which had been interrupted by the insertion of the genealogy. Compare Gen. xxxvii. 36, and xxxix. 1. If, moreover, the reiteration of the same ideas is urged, due regard ought to be paid to the genius of the ancient, especially the Oriental languages. in which the principal and leading ideas are repeatedly introduced, and often with nearly the same words. See note on ver. 12.

11. *Go*, namely, into the palace of the king. Compare, however, note to ii. 1, וילך . . . ויקח.

12. Moses had reported to the Israelites the commands of God; but they did not listen to him (ver. 9); therefore God ordered Moses to address his request now directly to Pharaoh, as the Israelites would certainly seize the opportunity to

מֶלֶךְ מִצְרָיִם וִישַׁלַּח אֶת־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאַרְצוֹ׃ 12 וַיְדַבֵּר מֹשֶׁה לִפְנֵי
יְהוָה לֵאמֹר הֵן בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא־שָׁמְעוּ אֵלַי וְאֵיךְ יִשְׁמָעֵנִי
פַרְעֹה וַאֲנִי עֲרַל שְׂפָתָיִם׃ פ
13 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וְאֶל־אַהֲרֹן וַיְצַוֵּם אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
וְאֶל־פַּרְעֹה מֶלֶךְ מִצְרָיִם לְהוֹצִיא אֶת־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאֶרֶץ
מִצְרָיִם׃ ס שני 14 אֵלֶּה רָאשֵׁי
בֵית־אֲבֹתָם בְּנֵי רְאוּבֵן בְּכֹר יִשְׂרָאֵל חֲנוֹךְ וּפַלּוּא חֶצְרֹן וְכַרְמִי
אֵלֶּה מִשְׁפְּחֹת רְאוּבֵן׃ 15 וּבְנֵי שִׁמְעוֹן יְמוּאֵל וְיָמִין וְאֹהַד
וְיָכִין וְצֹחַר וְשָׁאוּל בֶּן־הַכְּנַעֲנִית אֵלֶּה מִשְׁפְּחֹת שִׁמְעוֹן׃
16 וְאֵלֶּה שְׁמוֹת בְּנֵי־לֵוִי לְתֹלְדֹתָם גֵּרְשׁוֹן וּקְהָת וּמְרָרִי וּשְׁנֵי
חַיֵּי לֵוִי שֶׁבַע וּשְׁלֹשִׁים וּמְאַת שָׁנָה׃ 17 בְּנֵי גֵרְשׁוֹן לִבְנִי

leave Egypt if the king permitted it (ver. 11). But Moses objected—1st. that the Israelites did not hearken to his representation; how much less would Pharaoh consent, who would suffer great disadvantages by his compliance: and 2nd. that he was not gifted with the necessary power and grace of speech (ver. 12). Nevertheless God charged him anew to appeal again, accompanied by Aaron, both to the Israelites and to Pharaoh, and to repeat his commission, firmly promising that he would, at last, prevail (ver. 13). This is the natural and unforced connection of these verses. —*Of uncircumcised lips* (ערל שפתים) is synonymous with לא איש דברים in iv. 10, on which see our remarks. Targum Onkelos and Jonathan explain, correctly, *heavy of speech*; Septuagint, *ἄλογος*; Rashi, *shut, closed*; Kimchi takes ערלה as superfluous matter, which it would be advantageous to remove. The exact meaning of this phrase denotes a man "whose lips are closed, as it were, with the foreskin, and are, therefore, too long and thick to utter speech with facility" (Gesen.) The same metaphor is used of the heart (Lev. xxvi. 41; Ez. xliv. 9), and of the ear (Jer. vi. 10). It is, therefore, unnecessary, if not absurd, to suppose, with Clericus and others, that the skin by which the tongue of the new-born children is connected with the inner part of the mouth, had not been properly *cut off*, and that thus Moses was "uncircumcised of lips."—ואני, *as I am*, or *being*. The conjunction ו expresses frequently the reason, *since*, and implies, here, a still greater force: "*especially* since."

13. Rashi observes, that as Moses had objected that he was no man of eloquence, God addressed now Moses *and* Aaron, associating to him the latter as a spokesman. Our verse seems rather to contain a concise summary of the history of Israel's redemption, as far as it is hitherto related in the text.—*And He gave them a charge* (ויצום) *to the children of Israel*; so that no ellipsis, as לדבר or ללכת (as Rosenmüller assumes) is necessary. How the expression ויצום "raises the position of Moses into a significant sublimity, and bears the character of pompous boasting" as Philippson asserts, it is difficult to comprehend.

14. *The heads of their fathers' houses.* The Hebrew *tribes* (שבטים or מטות) were divided into *families* (משפחות, probably identical with אלפים; Judges

the children of Israel go out of his land. 12. And Moses spoke before the Lord, saying, Behold, the children of Israel have not hearkened to me; how then shall Pharaoh hear me, who *am* of uncircumcised lips? 13. Thus the Lord spoke to Moses and to Aaron, and gave them a charge to the children of Israel, and to Pharaoh king of Egypt, to bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt.—14. These *are* the heads of their fathers' houses: The sons of Reuben the firstborn of Israel: Hanoch, and Pallu, Hezron, and Carmi. These *are* the families of Reuben. 15. And the sons of Simeon: Jemuel, and Jamin, and Ohad, and Jachin, and Zohar, and Shaul the son of a Canaanitish woman. These *are* the families of Simeon. 16. And these *are* the names of the sons of Levi according to their generations: Gershon, and Kohath, and Merari; and the years of the life of Levi *were* one hundred and thirty-seven years. 17. The sons of Gershon: Libni,

vi. 15; 1 Sam. x. 19; gentes, *δῆμοι*); and the families again into *fathers' houses* (בית האבות or בתים; Septuagint, *οἶκοι πατριῶν*; compare Joshua vii. 14—18). These *fathers' houses* stood under the authority of *chiefs*, or *heads of fathers' houses*, who were, probably, like the chiefs of the tribes, elective, not hereditary dignities. (ראשי בית אבות, also called שרי האבות or נשיאי האבות; *πατριάρχαι*, patriarchs, as the Septuagint sometimes appropriately translates). However, not unfrequently בית אבות is used instead of משפחות; for instance, in Num. iii. 24, 30, 35; and this is the case in our passage also (see the first and last words of ver. 14); sometimes even both expressions are pleonastically combined, as Num. i. 2, 18, etc; ii. 34: למשפחתם לבית אבתם.—Now of Reuben and Simeon, the *families* (משפחות, *συγγένειαι* or *πατριαί*) are but briefly mentioned, whilst the tribe of Levi is more completely specified, with its families and members, from the reason already stated on ver. 10. Compare Genesis xlvi. 8—11.

15. The family of Ohad must have died out already in Egypt, or in the desert, because it is not mentioned in the genealogy contained in Numb. xxvi. 12 (Ebn Ezra). Instead of צחר we find there (ver. 13) זרח; both words, however, have the same meaning, *splendour*.

16. *According to their generations*; that is, with their families, or descendants (see ver. 17, 19). De Sacy, correctly: "et la suite de leur familles." As the origin and descent of Moses and Aaron is the chief and almost exclusive purpose of the genealogy here inserted, the *ages* of his direct ancestors are likewise mentioned, namely, that of Levi (137 years), Kohath (133 years), and Amram (137 years). Biblical chronology, a science as important as it is difficult, has a safe and welcome basis in the almost regular, and generally exact, statements of the ages of the representatives of the respective generations; and these continuous, almost uninterrupted statements, are another weighty proof of the unity of the Old Testament as a whole. Thus we find mentioned the years of the generations from Adam to Noah; from Noah to Abraham; then successively the lives of

וְשִׁמְעִי לְמִשְׁפְּחֹתָם׃ 18 וּבְנֵי קְהָת עַמְרָם וְיִצְהָר וְחֶבְרוֹן וְעֻזִּיאֵל
וּשְׁנֵי חַיֵּי קְהָת שָׁלֹשׁ וּשְׁלֹשִׁים וּמְאַת שָׁנָה׃ 19 וּבְנֵי מְרָרִי
מַחְלִי וּמוּשִׁי אֵלֶּה מִשְׁפְּחֹת הַלֵּוִי לְתֹלְדֹתָם׃ 20 וַיִּקַּח עַמְרָם
אֶת־יוֹכֶבֶד דֹּדָתוֹ לוֹ לְאִשָּׁה וַתֵּלֶד לוֹ אֶת־אַהֲרֹן וְאֶת־מֹשֶׁה
וּשְׁנֵי חַיֵּי עַמְרָם שֶׁבַע וּשְׁלֹשִׁים וּמְאַת שָׁנָה׃ 21 וּבְנֵי יִצְהָר
קֹרַח וָנֶפֶג וְזִכְרִי׃ 22 וּבְנֵי עֻזִּיאֵל מִישָׁאֵל וְאֶלְצָפָן וְסִתְרִי׃
23 וַיִּקַּח אַהֲרֹן אֶת־אֱלִישֶׁבַע בַּת־עַמִּינָדָב אֲחוֹת נַחְשׁוֹן לוֹ
לְאִשָּׁה וַתֵּלֶד לוֹ אֶת־נָדָב וְאֶת־אֲבִיהוּא אֶת־אֶלְעָזָר וְאֶת־אִיתָמָר׃
24 וּבְנֵי קֹרַח אַסִּיר וְאֶלְקָנָה וַאֲבִיאָסָף אֵלֶּה מִשְׁפְּחֹת הַקָּרְחִי׃
25 וְאֶלְעָזָר בֶּן־אַהֲרֹן לָקַח־לוֹ מִבְּנוֹת פּוּטִיאֵל לוֹ לְאִשָּׁה וַתֵּלֶד
לוֹ אֶת־פִּינְחָס אֵלֶּה רָאשֵׁי אֲבוֹת הַלְוִיִּם לְמִשְׁפְּחֹתָם׃ 26 הוּא
אַהֲרֹן וּמֹשֶׁה אֲשֶׁר אָמַר יְהוָה לָהֶם הוֹצִיאוּ אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאֶרֶץ

Isaac, Jacob, Levi, Kohath, Amram, Moses, Joshua, the Judges, and the Kings; then the exile of seventy years, and, lastly, the further generations during the second temple, in the book of Daniel.

20. *And Amram took to himself Jochebed his aunt* (דֹּדָתוֹ) *to wife.* Targum Onkelos translates correctly: "his father's sister;" for Jochebed was *the daughter of Levi, born to him in Egypt* (Num. xxvi. 59), and, therefore, the sister of Kohath, the father of Amram; see, however, our note on ii. 1, and *Introduction*, § 2.—לו, reflective pronoun, *to himself*, see our note on v. 19.—Some manuscripts have ואת־מרים אחתם after אהרן, which addition is also expressed by the Samaritan, the Septuagint, and the Syrian versions. Although Miriam takes not an unimportant part in the following history, we are not justified in inserting here these words, as the female progeny is generally not enumerated in genealogies.

21, 22. The sons of Kohath are: 1st. Amram, 2nd. Izhar, 3rd. Hebron, 4th. Uzziel. Now, the children of Amram are mentioned on account of Moses and Aaron; the progeny of Izhar on account of Korah, who rebelled against Moses (Num. xvi, xvii.) and that of Uzziel, on account of his sons Mishael and Elzaphan, mentioned in Levit. x. 4, 5. But the children of Hebron, although he had sons (Num. iii. 27), are not introduced because they act no conspicuous parts in the Pentateuch; for this appears to have been the guiding principle in the compilation of the Biblical genealogies.

23. *The wife of Aaron, Elisheba* (Septuagint, 'Ελισαβέτ, for אלי שבעת), is, according to Ebn Ezra, mentioned as *the mother of priesthood* (אם הכהונה; see Numb. xx. 25; xxv. 13), whilst Jochebed is *the mother of prophecy* (אם הנבואה).

25. About Pinehas see Numb. xxv. 11—13.

26. *These are that Aaron and Moses to whom God*, etc. With these words the narration returns easily to verse 13, where it was interrupted for the insertion of the genealogy of the legislator, and his brother, the first pontifical dignitary. This is naturally done with a certain

and Shimi, according to their families. 18. And the sons of Kohath: Amram, and Izhar, and Hebron, and Uzziel; and the years of the life of Kohath *were* one hundred and thirty-three years. 19. And the sons of Merari: Mahali and Mushi. These *are* the families of Levi according to their generations. 20. And Amram took to himself Jochebed his aunt to wife, and she bare him Aaron and Moses; and the years of the life of Amram *were* one hundred and thirty-seven years. 21. And the sons of Izhar: Korah, and Nepheg, and Zichri. 22. And the sons of Uzziel: Mishael, and Elzaphan, and Sithri. 23. And Aaron took to himself Elisheba, daughter of Amminadab, sister of Nahshon, to wife; and she bare him Nadab, and Abihu, Elazar, and Ithamar. 24. And the sons of Korah: Assir, and Elkanah, and Abiasaph. These are the families of the Korhite. 25. And Elazar Aaron's son took to himself *one* of the daughters of Putiel to wife; and she bare him Pinehas. These *are* the heads of the fathers of the Levites according to their families. 26. These *are that* Aaron and Moses, to whom the Lord said, Bring out the children of Israel from the land of Egypt accord-

emphasis — (those are that Aaron and Moses; these are they that spoke to Pharaoh; these are that Moses and Aaron, vers. 26, 27), but without "grandiloquy," or pride. It is strange to observe that this passage, and especially the simple personal pronouns הוא and הם have been made to serve as proofs against the authenticity of the Pentateuch; for, says Clericus, "they could not have been used by Moses, if he had spoken of himself," and Vater remarks: "Thus an author writes only of men who lived long before his time." But we need scarcely remind our readers that our text naturally points with some stress to Moses and Aaron, on whose account alone the genealogy had been inserted; and those words mean simply: this is the descent of Moses and Aaron, who were now sent to Pharaoh; and they correspond precisely with verses 13, 14, thus returning to the commencement of the parenthetical list, and indicating its conclusion.—In our verse, which finishes the *genealogy*, Aaron is named before Moses, being the *elder* brother; but in verse 27, which forms the transition to the *history*, Moses has precedence before Aaron, being superior in *dignity* and importance; and thus the former order is observed in all genealogical accounts (Num. iii. 1; xxvi. 59); the latter, everywhere else, where they are henceforth mentioned together. Ebn Ezra's remark, "Aaron is here mentioned first, because he prophesied to the Israelites before Moses," is, therefore, unfounded.—*According to their hosts*, על צבאתם, after the analogy of איש על מחנהו, "every one according to his camp" (Num. i. 52). צבא signifies here, obviously, the tribes and their families, which, on the journeys, marched in separate bodies. The Vulgate translates correctly: "per turmas suas." Less appropriate is the rendering

מִצְרַיִם עַל־צִבְאֹתָם׃ 27 הֵם הַמְדַבְּרִים אֶל־פַּרְעֹה מֶלֶךְ־מִצְרַיִם
לְהוֹצִיא אֶת־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּצְרָיִם הוּא מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן׃ 28 וַיְהִי בְּיוֹם
דִּבֶּר יְהוָֹה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ ס שלישי 29 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָֹה
אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר אֲנִי יְהוָֹה דַּבֵּר אֶל־פַּרְעֹה מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם אֵת
כָּל־אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי דֹּבֵר אֵלֶיךָ׃ 30 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה לִפְנֵי יְהוָֹה הֵן אֲנִי
עֲרַל שְׂפָתַיִם וְאֵיךְ יִשְׁמַע אֵלַי פַּרְעֹה׃ פ

of those who take על here in the sense of ב (compare Gen. xxvii. 40), and translate: *with their armies;* thus the Septuagint (σὺν δυνάμει αὐτῶν), Rashi, Luther, and others.

28—30. The 28th verse is to be connected with the following; and Rashi already objects to the masoretical separation of both verses, indicated by ס (פרשה סתומה sectio clausa). Ebn Ezra finds it likewise surprising, without, however, venturing a decisive opinion on the subject. The explanation of Rosenmüller, who is desirous to accommodate himself to the traditional division: "And this event—namely, that Moses and Aaron spoke to Pharaoh (ver. 27)—took place on the day when God exhorted Moses to

ז 1 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָֹה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה רְאֵה נְתַתִּיךָ אֱלֹהִים לְפַרְעֹה וְאַהֲרֹן
אָחִיךָ יִהְיֶה נְבִיאֶךָ׃ 2 אַתָּה תְדַבֵּר אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר אֲצַוֶּךָּ
וְאַהֲרֹן אָחִיךָ יְדַבֵּר אֶל־פַּרְעֹה וְשִׁלַּח אֶת־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאַרְצוֹ׃
3 וַאֲנִי אַקְשֶׁה אֶת־לֵב פַּרְעֹה וְהִרְבֵּיתִי אֶת־אֹתֹתַי וְאֶת־מוֹפְתַי

CHAPTER VII.

1, 2. These verses contain the direct answer to the objection raised by Moses in the last verse of the preceding chapter: that he shall not himself speak before Pharaoh, but his eloquent brother Aaron, to whom he shall suggest the ideas imparted to him by God Himself, and who will thus be his spokesman, whilst he will stand to Aaron as well as to Pharaoh in the relation of a God—exactly as it was expressed in iv. 16: "and he shall indeed be to thee instead of a mouth (לפה), and thou shalt be to him instead of God" (see our note there); but the power and influence of Moses were not limited to Aaron alone, but extended over Pharaoh also. It is, therefore, evident: 1. That נביא in our verse is identical in meaning with פה in the passage just quoted; and Targum Onkelos, in fact, translates both words with מתורגמן, interpreter,—and 2. That it is to be taken in its original etymological meaning of *spokesman* (from נבא=נבע to pour out words; not from נוב, as Rashi observes, although נוב and נבע are kindred roots). God reveals His will to mankind through the mouth of a prophet who speaks out the thoughts disclosed to him; just so should Moses use Aaron as the expounder of his ideas. Compare Jeremiah xv. 19. כפי תהיה; *Virgil,* Aen. iv. 378; Philo iv. p. 116: "For a prophet speaks no thoughts of his own, but those of another, who suggests them to him." Nor can, from this point of view, the signification of אלהים be doubtful: Moses shall act with regard to Pharaoh, and dictate with regard to Aaron, as the direct representative and messenger of God, and in His name and

ing to their [1]hosts. 27. These *are* they who spoke to Pharaoh king of Egypt, to bring out the children of Israel from Egypt: these *are that* Moses and Aaron.—28. And it came to pass on the day *when* the Lord spoke to Moses in the land of Egypt, 29. That the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, I am the Eternal: speak thou to Pharaoh king of Egypt all that I say to thee. 30. And Moses said before the Lord, Behold, I *am* of uncircumcised lips, and how shall Pharaoh hearken to me?

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Armies.

his mission (ver. 28); *for* the Lord spoke (ver. 29)"; this explanation is ungrammatical and illogical. —The following address of God is the same as that contained in ver. 11, as the objections of Moses in ver. 30 are, with slight alterations, identical with those of ver. 12; and this repetition serves merely to the harmony of the style. — אני י״י stands here with the same emphasis: "I am the eternal and immutable accomplisher of my promises," as in vers. 2 and 8.

CHAP. VII. 1. And the Lord said to Moses, See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh; and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet. 2. Thou shalt speak all that I command thee; and Aaron thy brother shall speak to Pharaoh, that he send the children of Israel out of his land. 3. And I shall harden Pharaoh's heart, and multiply my

authority.—Many interpreters believing the designation "as a God" too sublime for a human being of even the exalted morality of Moses, have vaguely paraphrased the word אלהים; so Targum Onkelos and Saadiah render "master"; Jonathan, "Formidable to Pharaoh as if thou wert his God"; Rashi, "His superior and master, authorized to punish him with plagues and afflictions"; Ebn Ezra, "Angel."

2. *Thou shalt speak*, namely, to Aaron; and the Septuagint adds already *αὐτῷ*.—*And Aaron, thy brother, shall speak to Pharaoh*: "And thy brother Aaron shall convey to Pharaoh thy ideas in adorned and captivating speech" (*Rashi*).—"Although Aaron is not always mentioned when Moses went to Pharaoh, it is understood, that both repaired to him always together" (*Ebn Ezra*).—*That he send* (ושלח) The Vav conversivum præteriti in futurum has here, as frequently, the signification of a conjunction of end and purpose, so that ושלח is here identical with וישלח (vi. 11). But this is not the case in ver. 3, in והרביתי, which Luther translates: "that I may multiply my signs and wonders"; nor in ver. 4, ונתתי את ידי, which the English Version renders, "that I may lay my hand upon Egypt," which would imply the very improper idea, expressed also by several other interpreters, that the obstinacy of Pharaoh was intentionally and studiously provoked by God, in order to enable Him to show His might and glory.

3. *And I shall harden Pharaoh's heart.* See our note on iv. 21.

4. *And I shall lay my hand*, i. e., as Targum Onkelos renders: "The plague of my power," or my severe plagues.—

בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 4 וְלֹא־יִשְׁמַע אֲלֵכֶם פַּרְעֹה וְנָתַתִּי אֶת־יָדִי
בְּמִצְרָיִם וְהוֹצֵאתִי אֶת־צִבְאֹתַי אֶת־עַמִּי בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאֶרֶץ
מִצְרַיִם בִּשְׁפָטִים גְּדֹלִים׃ 5 וְיָדְעוּ מִצְרַיִם כִּי־אֲנִי יְהוָה בִּנְטֹתִי
אֶת־יָדִי עַל־מִצְרָיִם וְהוֹצֵאתִי אֶת־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִתּוֹכָם׃ 6 וַיַּעַשׂ
מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֹתָם כֵּן עָשׂוּ׃ 7 וּמֹשֶׁה בֶּן־שְׁמֹנִים
שָׁנָה וְאַהֲרֹן בֶּן־שָׁלֹשׁ וּשְׁמֹנִים שָׁנָה בְּדַבְּרָם אֶל־פַּרְעֹה׃ פ רביעי
8 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וְאֶל־אַהֲרֹן לֵאמֹר׃ 9 כִּי יְדַבֵּר אֲלֵכֶם
פַּרְעֹה לֵאמֹר תְּנוּ לָכֶם מוֹפֵת וְאָמַרְתָּ אֶל־אַהֲרֹן קַח אֶת־מַטְּךָ

צבאתי is taken here in the signification, in which it is used in vi. 26, including the whole people with its tribes, so that the words, "my people the children of Israel," stands in apposition to **צבאתי**.—About **שפטים**, judgments, i. e. punishments, see on vi. 6.

5. From the nature of the plagues which I shall bring over Egypt, they will know that only a being of such attributes as are implied in my holy name, i. e., that only the God of the Israelites, has inflicted them upon their land. Thus the Egyptians will perceive and acknowledge their infatuation, with which they had formerly denied the God of Israel, the Lord of the universe, however different such knowledge of God, forced upon them by fear and punishment, might be from the ready belief of pious minds. We have therefore translated **יהוה** here also *the Eternal*, not the Lord; besides the section from vi. 2 to vii. 7, belongs together (see on vi. 10).—The infinitive **בנטתי** is in the following part of the sentence changed with the future **והוצאתי**.

6. *And Moses and Aaron did as the Lord commanded them.* Henceforth all hesitation and diffidence on the part of Moses and Aaron ceased, and they now applied themselves confidently to the execution of their great charge.—Ebn Ezra connects these words with the following wonders performed by Moses and Aaron on the behest of God. See, however, on vi. 10.—*So they did*, an emphatical repetition, expressing their zeal and readiness in fulfilling the divine commands.

7. Moses was eighty, and Aaron eighty-three years old, when they appeared before Pharaoh. These are valuable dates of the highest importance for the chronological arrangement of this whole period of the Hebrew history. An octogenarian might appear too far advanced in years to possess sufficient physical strength or mental energy for the arduous duties he was to perform, and the unusual privations he was to endure. But Moses was in every respect of such an extraordinary and almost exceptional organization, he was of a nature so infinitely superior to the common mass, that he cannot be measured after the usual standard. A man who framed, in a dark age, laws destined to guide mankind to the remotest generations, must even constitutionally have possessed a greater vigourousness than is ordinarily allotted to man. From this point of view, it is even scarcely necessary to urge, that God miraculously strengthened him as His chosen instrument and His greatest prophet, or that he had led a life calculated to preserve the inborn strength, first in the splendour of an Egyptian court, and afterwards in the simplicity of pastoral pursuits

signs and my wonders in the land of Egypt. 4. But
Pharaoh [1]will not hearken to you, [2]and I shall lay my
hand upon Egypt, and bring forth my [3]hosts, [4]my people
the children of Israel, out of the land of Egypt, by great
judgments. 5. And the Egyptians shall know that I *am*
[5]the Eternal, when I shall stretch forth my hand upon
Egypt, and bring out the children of Israel from among
them.—6. And Moses and Aaron did as the Lord commanded
them; so they did. 7. And Moses was eighty
years old, and Aaron eighty-three years old, when they
spoke to Pharaoh.

8. And the Lord spoke to Moses and to Aaron, saying,
9. When Pharaoh will speak to you, saying, Show a
miracle for you: then thou shalt say to Aaron, Take thy
[6]staff, and cast *it* before Pharaoh, *and* it shall become a

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Shall. [2] That I may lay. [3] Armies. [4] *And* my people. [5] The Lord. [6] Rod.

CHAPTER VII. 8 TO VIII. 11.

SUMMARY.—The ten plagues are preceded by the sign, that the staff of Aaron was converted into a serpent, devouring the serpents of the Egyptian magicians, which they produced with their staffs by help of their secret arts (vii. 8—12). But Pharaoh persisted in his obstinacy; and God inflicted therefore upon Egypt the first plague: all the water of the country, even that preserved in vessels, was turned into *blood*, the fish in the Nile died, the water of the river itself became undrinkable, and the inhabitants were compelled to dig for wells, yielding, in Egypt, generally very distasteful and unwholesome water. But when the magicians likewise converted, by their arts, some water into blood, Pharaoh despised the request of Moses (ver. 13—25). Seven days after the first plague, therefore, God covered the whole land of Egypt with *frogs*, which, forsaking their natural element, the water, penetrated into "the houses, the bed-chambers, ovens, and kneading troughs," tormenting the Egyptians with their noise and their fetid smell. And as the magicians, although they contrived to produce frogs, were unable to remove them, Pharaoh, with mortified pride, requested Moses to pray to the Lord for deliverance from the plague, promising to permit the departure of the Israelites. On the fervent prayer of Moses the plague ceased on the following day (vii. 26 to viii. 11).

8. From this verse the narrative, which had been at a standstill from vi. 10, steadily and interestingly proceeds with facts and events, directly leading to the aim of Moses' mission, the redemption of the Israelites from Egypt.

9. Even if Pharaoh should be more inclined to listen to your request, not saying, "Who is the Lord, that I should hearken to his voice" (v. 2), or "Go to your burdens" (v. 4), he will naturally demand signs for yourselves (לכם), to accredit yourselves as God's messengers, as a proof that you are really deputed by a powerful and eternal being; the more so, as even the Israelites required such evidence of their being the true delegates of God. It is, therefore, obvious that מופת is a miraculous, supernatural sign, and distinguished from אות, which is simply a proof or criterion; although the same performances, which are here called מופתים, are on former occasions mentioned as אתת (iv. 8, 17, 30), and

וְהַשְׁלֵךְ לִפְנֵי־פַרְעֹה יְהִי לְתַנִּין׃ 10 וַיָּבֹא מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן אֶל־
פַּרְעֹה וַיַּעֲשׂוּ־כֵן כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה וַיַּשְׁלֵךְ אַהֲרֹן אֶת־מַטֵּהוּ לִפְנֵי
פַרְעֹה וְלִפְנֵי עֲבָדָיו וַיְהִי לְתַנִּין׃ 11 וַיִּקְרָא גַּם־פַּרְעֹה לַחֲכָמִים
וְלַמְכַשְּׁפִים וַיַּעֲשׂוּ גַם־הֵם חַרְטֻמֵּי מִצְרַיִם בְּלַהֲטֵיהֶם כֵּן׃ 12 וַיַּשְׁלִיכוּ

אתת and מופתים are frequently coupled (Deut. iv. 34; vii. 19; xxvi. 8, etc.; the Septuagint translates in our verse likewise *δότε σημεῖον ἢ τέρας*): for the criterion or proof given might, as in our passage, be of a prodigious, superhuman character; and thus the אתת are indeed called מפתים in iv. 21.—The staff, which Aaron is ordered to take, is certainly the staff of Moses, which he possessed already in the desert of Sinai (iv. 2), and which he took with him when he returned to Egypt (iv. 20).—והשלך scil. אתו, the accusative of the personal pronoun being omitted; see note to ii. 3, ותשם בסוף.—תנין, *serpent*, here identical with נחש (ver. 15, and iv. 3), is originally any huge, monstrous animal (from תנן, to extend, to be enlarged), therefore dragon, crocodile, sea-monster (*κῆτος*) or serpent.

11. מכשף (Part. Piel of כשף, originally to offer up supplications or prayers, then limited to idolatrous worship; to use magical songs or formulas), a magician or *enchanter*. The Septuagint renders *φαρμακός*; the Vulgate, maleficus, or maleficis artibus inserviens; Ebn Ezra, "those who are experienced to alter the external appearance of things by their arts"; Michaelis, "a man who professes to be able to produce an eclipse of the sun by magical songs;" (from the Arabic root كسف pallidus fuit, or eclipsin passus est sol, or, obscuravit Deus solem), which latter signification is, however, certainly too far-fetched.—The חרטמי מצרים are here evidently identical with the חכמים and מכשפים. About their nature and the knowledge they possessed, see supplementary note to ii. 10, p. 40.—Already Targum Jonathan mentions the names of the two chief Chartumim, namely, ייניס (or Jochana, *Ἰαννῆς*), and ימברים (or Jamberos, Mamre, *Ἰαμβρῆς*, 2 Tim. iii. 8), see Talm. Menach. 85, *a*; *Sohar* on Numb. xxii. 22; *Buxtorf*, Lex. Talm. p. 945, *et seq.*; see also *Pliny's* Hist. Nat. xxx. 1, where Jamnes and Jotapes, the magicians, are called contemporaries of Moses; compare *Eusebius*, Praep. Evang. ix. 8, 27. Jamnes and Jambrês were called by the Mohammedans *Sadur* and *Gadur* (Koran, vii. 116).—להטים or לטים ver. 22 (from the root לחט, coinciding with לוט and לאט, to hide, but not with להט to flame, as Rashi, Maimonides and Ebn Ezra, opine; therefore, to use occult magical arts, unknown to the bulk of the people), *incantations*, and so translates Targum Onkelos, בלחשיהן, "with their spells," which were recited in a low, muttering voice (compare Aquila: *ἐν ἠρεμαίαις αὐτῶν*; Septuagint, *ταῖς φαρμακίαις αὐτῶν*; Saadiah, "by their hidden arts").—The words "enchanters," and "with their incantations," here used with reference to the Chartumim, are evidently intended to characterize the arts of the latter as contemptible acts of clerical imposition, whilst the epithet *wise men*, does not enhance their dignity, as the words signifying knowledge, or wisdom, are, in the Semitic languages, used in connection even with poisoners, jugglers, and all individuals who were considered to possess more knowledge than the common mass of the people, whatever the nature of that knowledge might be (compare عراف, hariolus, from عرف, scivit). The sense is, therefore: although the Egyptian magicians had, likewise, the power of converting staffs into serpents, they owed it to demoniac and pernicious arts, whilst Moses and Aaron possessed it as a gift

serpent. 10. And Moses and Aaron went to Pharaoh, and they did so as the Lord had commanded: and Aaron cast down his staff before Pharaoh, and before his servants, and it became a serpent. 11. Then Pharaoh also called the wise men and the sorcerers: now the Egyptian [1]interpreters of secret signs, they also did in the like manner with their [2]hidden arts. 12. For they cast down every man his [3]staff, and they became serpents: but Aaron's

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Magicians. [2] Enchantments. [3] Rod.

of the Most High, and, therefore, easily conquered their idolatrous and superstitious rivals. See ver. 12, and *Josephus*, Antiq. II. xiii. 3.

12. The magicians threw down their staffs (which they carried always as a sign of their clerical dignity, as the Roman augurs bore the *lituus*, a crooked staff without knots: Liv. i. 18; compare *Cicero* De Divin. i. 17); they were also converted into serpents—but these were swallowed by the serpents of Aaron (not "their staffs were devoured by the staff of Aaron," as Rashi and others believe). Thus a certain degree of power and skill is here attributed to the Egyptian priests, although decidedly inferior to that bestowed by God on Moses and Aaron. It cannot be denied that the Pentateuch considers miracles performed, apparently not in the name of the God of Israel, but under the fancied influence of other deities, as not impossible, and that it admits even predictions, which might be realized, and which are called "*false* signs," only because they are given in a bad cause, and for an objectionable purpose; see especially, Deut. xiii. 2—6; compare Matt. ix. 34; xii. 24; xxiv. 24. In a similar light the performances of the Egyptian magicians, in our passage, and on succeeding occasions, are undoubtedly to be viewed; they are, in a certain manner, likewise to be considered as miracles; the magicians are not bare impostors, nor are their performances mere deceitful tricks, but these miracles were of a lower order; for how could Moses hope to make an impression upon the king by the *same* signs? However, if we admit a certain power of the magicians, we reject, most unconditionally, from the notions of the Pentateuch, all interference of "evil spirits," which would thus be endowed with a power independent of that of God. All wisdom and might emanates from Him; nothing is more preposterous, and more at variance with the nature of the One God who fills the universe, than the idea of a sharing of His power with other, however subordinate, spirits; and if, therefore, idolators or false prophets are sometimes endowed with supernatural gifts, it is the God of Israel alone who bestows them from inscrutable reasons, and no other superior being; for there exists none besides Him. And yet, even recent commentators have repeated such monstrous opinions. Gerlach remarks: "We find among many heathen nations, in the service of their false religions, a certain art of conjuration, in which, certainly, the application of secret powers of nature, and cunning, have a large share, but which, no doubt, stand under the influence of evil spirits." (!) And Scott writes: "They, who reverence the Scriptures, will hardly deny, that many of the magicians had *a real intercourse with evil spirits* (sic!), and, *by their help*, actually made discoveries, and produced effects beyond the reach or power of human sagacity . . . . We cannot, indeed, in general assign exact bounds to the power of evil spirits, who, when permitted, seem capable of anything which created beings can do." Similarly, even Clarke.—On the other

אִישׁ מַטֵּהוּ וַיִּהְיוּ לְתַנִּינִם וַיִּבְלַע מַטֵּה־אַהֲרֹן אֶת־מַטֹּתָם׃
13 וַיֶּחֱזַק לֵב פַּרְעֹה וְלֹא שָׁמַע אֲלֵהֶם כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה׃ ס

hand, we have already observed on iv. 4, that the art of taming serpents to such a point, that they, at the command of their masters, alternately become stiff like sticks, and resume their natural forms, was much practised in Egypt and the whole Orient; and is still carried on in our time. We read in the "Déscription de l'Egypte" (i. p. 159): "The serpent Haje, is that sort of reptile which the jugglers of Cairo know best how to turn to account; they tame it, and teach it a great number of tricks more or less extraordinary; they can, as they say, *change the Haje into a stick*, and make it appear like dead. After some preparations it seems, indeed, to assume these forms." The mystery which hangs round this subject, has not yet been quite dispelled. The art of conjuring serpents is hereditary in certain families. The charmers travel, in great numbers, through towns and villages, allure, by different contrivances, the serpents which are hidden in the secret recesses of the houses, and seize them by various artifices. They are safe against their bite, to such a degree that they not only allow them to creep around their bodies, but provoke them even to anger. Without ocular perception they smell the presence of serpents by their strong exhalation, and the latter follow the artificial sounds which the conjurors apply to attract them. We further insert the following account of Lane (Modern Egypt, ii. p. 230), as that of an accurate and calm recent observer: "As the serpent seeks the darkest place in which to hide himself, the charmer has, in most cases, to exercise his skill in an obscure chamber, where he might easily take a serpent from his bosom, bring it to the people without the door, and affirm that he had found it in the apartment, for no one would venture to enter with him after having been assured of the presence of one of these reptiles within: but he is often required to perform in the full light of day, surrounded by spectators, and incredulous persons have searched him beforehand, and even stripped him naked, yet his success has been complete. He assumes an air of mystery, strikes the walls with a short palm-stick, whistles, makes a chuckling noise with his tongue, and spits upon the ground, and generally says: 'I adjure you by God, if ye be above, or if ye be below, that ye come forth: I adjure you by the most great name, if ye be obedient, come forth; and if ye be disobedient, die! die! die!' The serpent is generally dislodged by his stick, from a fissure in the wall, or drops from the ceiling of the room. I have often heard it asserted that the serpent-charmer, before he enters a house in which he is to try his skill, always employs a servant of that house to introduce one or more serpents; but I have known instances in which this could not be the case; and am inclined to believe that the darweeshes above-mentioned are generally acquainted with some real physical means of discovering the presence of serpents, without seeing them, and of attracting them from their lurking-places" (compare also *Aelian*, Hist. Anim. xvii. 5; *Sil. Ital.* iii. 300; *Strabo*, xii. 814; *Gellius*, Noct. Att. xvi. 11; compare Psalm lviii. 5, *et seq.*; the staff of Aesculapius entwined by a serpent; and the verb נחש, originally to prophesy by ὀφιομαντεία, then, generally, to prophesy; נַחַשׁ, omen, augury, Numbers xxiv. 1).—J. D. Michaelis observes, that the magicians probably applied a certain kind of serpents, which have the appearance of a stick as long as they do not move, but which naturally become manifest as serpents, if thrown to the ground. Modern travellers have considerably increased our knowledge concerning these extraordinary feats; and if we compare their almost unanimous accounts, we must come to the conclusion that the

staff swallowed up their staffs. 13. And [1]the heart of Pharaoh remained hardened, and he hearkened not to them, as the Lord had said.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—He hardened Pharaoh's heart.

minds of the conjurors were, during their operations, in the highest possible state of excitement and enthusiasm, and that a cool and deliberate imposition is out of the question. Detailed and interesting descriptions will be found in *Shaw*, Travels, p. 354; *Niebuhr*, Travels, i. 189; Déscription de l'Egypte, viii. 108, xviii. 1, 333; *Quatermère*, Mém. sur l'Egypte, i. 202; *Minutoli*, Travels, p. 226; *Hengstenberg*, Mos. and Eg. p. 97—103.

13. The tyrant's wounded pride darkened still more the blindness of his intellect; carried away by his fatal infatuation he ruined himself and his country by the plagues, which the hand of the Almighty now inflicts upon him. However, before entering upon the explanation of those punishments individually, we deem it advisable to premise

A GENERAL SURVEY OF THE TEN PLAGUES.

The picture which the inspired writer draws of the plagues of Egypt, and which he executes with uncommon care and exactness, is deeply interesting in more than one point of view. It represents the grand and imposing struggle between the boundless power of the Omnipotent, and the refractory pride of a demented prince; between the wisdom of the fountain of knowledge, and the boasting vanity of the frail human intellect; between the Lord of the universe and the idols of a heathen country; in a word, it depicts the eternal struggle of Truth against Error, of Monotheism against Paganism. That in this unequal combat divine omnipotence gained an easy victory over mortal impotence, and that Truth triumphed over Fallacy, is as natural and obvious as the fact, that Moses, the humble agent and instrument of the Lord, although, as a mere medium, he disappears almost in the narrative, obtains in the reader's mind the superiority over the haughty magicians and their presumptuous conceit. But that God inflicted ten successive plagues to break the king's contumacy, whilst he might have annihilated him with one mighty stroke, shows that God mercifully tried to convince and move the tyrant by less dangerous visitations, calculated merely to impress him with some idea of the unlimited means at His command; and only when Pharaoh's obstinacy grew more and more inveterate, the number and formidable character of the plagues were increased. And as in the hand of Providence *every* event becomes a means to a higher aim, the miseries which befell Pharaoh in consequence of his own obduracy, were at the same time intended by God to manifest to all the nations of the earth His supreme power, and to induce them to abandon their idolatrous worship, and to acknowledge His exclusive sovereignty. "But only for this cause have I let thee exist, in order to show thee my power, and that my name be acknowledged throughout all the earth (ix. 16; x. 1, 2, etc.). We cannot therefore see, as Wilson does, in such passages any "proof, that the ancient Jews had no scruples as to the question of fair-dealing with Pharaoh; that the latter can only be viewed as an anvil for the strokes of the divine hammer, and that we are not to look for a high order of ethics in the Biblical times." Such deductions are the unavoidable result of a system of interpretation, in which superficial declamation and inveterate prejudice take the place of patient research and unbiassed examination.

Now, if we analyze the nature of the plagues as narrated in our text, we cannot but acknowledge the *miraculous character* with which all, without exception, are stamped; and the efforts of many scholars (as especially of Eichhorn in his treatise

"de anno mirabilí Aegypti"), who took pains to explain those visitations as natural phenomena, have proved signally unsuccessful, futile, and often ludicrous. Conscientious and unprejudiced commentators will deferentially abstain from forcing their own preconceived notions into the simplicity of the sacred text, which alone can form a safe basis for an authentic interpretation; they will modestly declare themselves to be the mere echo of tradition. It is sufficient in the exposition of ancient works, to trace and develop the probable meaning which the author intended to convey. It is not always feasible to form an exact judgment on the nature and value of the facts and ideas communicated: a task, which the commentator may with propriety leave to every reader individually after having put him in possession of all materials necessary to arrive at a well-established opinion. However, it is, on the other hand, easily discernible that all these plagues are *based* upon natural circumstances or phenomena of Egypt; we know that the Nile indeed assumes annually a red colour at a certain season; that generally immediately after this time, the slime of the river breeds a vast number of frogs; that the air is filled with swarms of tormenting insects; and after the same analogy in all other plagues; and the reader will find in the following remarks on these inflictions the necessary natural-historic accounts bearing on the subject, and affording many points of comparison between the narrative of the holy text and the observations of geographers and travellers. In fact, the whole force of the following narrative will be lost to those, who read it without reference to the natural condition of Egypt; whereas a careful regard to this point will interestingly illustrate both the admirable climax of the punishments of Pharaoh and the truthfulness and authenticity of the descriptions. But the miraculous character of those phenomena is unmistakeably observable in the following points: 1. They take place at a time contrary to their usual occurrence; 2. They happen within a space of a few months in rapid succession, whilst at least some of them are of very rare occurrence (see notes to the 8th and 9th plagues); 3. Their injurious character is infinitely aggravated; as, for instance, by the first plague not only the water of the Nile is converted into blood, but also all its numerous fishes die; 4. They occur at the time predicted by Moses and at his command; 5. They generally cease at his prayer; and 6. The Egyptians only are afflicted by them, whilst the Israelites are exempted from their calamitous effects (see viii. 18; ix. 4, 6, 26; x. 23; xii. 12, *et caet.*). Perhaps the *number* even of the plagues is not insignificant, as ten is in the Old Testament the number of *perfection* (see note on xx. 1—14); and the ten plagues which freed Israel from the yoke of Egypt's king, may be contrasted with the ten commandments, by which Israel accepted the sovereignty of God.

The *order*, arrangement and successive gradation of the ten dispensations have been made the subject of minute examination on the part of Jewish commentators. So observes Rashbam (on vii. 26), that always two plagues are preceded by their announcement, whilst the third takes place without previous warning. Thus Moses announces the blood and the frogs, the gnats he does not threaten; beetles and pestilence are introduced with a caution to Pharaoh, and boils not; the same is the case with the hail and the locusts on the one hand, and with darkness on the other. Abarbanel finds a still more artificial harmony in the external execution of the nine first plagues: *a*) The first, fourth, and seventh are prefaced by the words: "Go before Pharaoh early in the morning"—and are announced to Pharaoh and his court; *b*) The second, fifth, and eighth are only preceded by the words: "Go to Pharaoh"—and are predicted to Pharaoh alone and secretly; and *c*) The third, sixth and ninth are not announced at all—and were at once executed before the Egyptian people.—The same commentator observes (on viii. 16), that according to the Biblical relation three wonders—blood, frogs and gnats—were performed by Aaron; three others—hail, locusts and darkness—by Moses; and three—beetles, pestilence and death of the first-born—by God himself, without the medium of Moses and Aaron; and one—boils—

by Moses and Aaron together (conpare Ebn Ezra on viii. 12, and Cusari i. 83). He further maintains, that the five first plagues were produced by the two grosser elements, water and earth; the five latter by the two light elements, fire and air; namely, blood and frogs by the water; the next three, gnats, beetles and pestilence, by the earth; the following two, boils and hail, by fire (ix. 10—23); and locusts, darkness and death of the first-born by the air.—Rabbi Jehudah Halevi (quoted by Ebn Ezra on ix. 1) considers more rationally the six last plagues from pestilence, as the effects of an infested air, only admitting the co-operation of fire in the seventh plague (that of hail).—The uninterrupted climax in the terrific nature of the plagues has always been pointed out and explained in the following commentary. We will here but briefly consider the successive effects, which these miracles produced on the hard-heartedness of Pharaoh.—When Moses first requested the king, to grant to the oppressed people of Israel but a few days' leave for the celebration of a religious festival, he was met with the insulting reply: "Who is God, that I should listen to his voice, and let Israel go? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go," and the burdens of Israel were enhanced instead of being alleviated. Nor had the wonder of the staff transformed into a serpent any effect on the obstinacy of the king, as his wise men exhibited a similar performance, and the circumstance, that the serpent of Moses devoured the serpents of his councillors, was to him but a proof that the art of Moses was, in some degree, more developed, but not of a different or higher order. As little influence had the first plague, the transmutation of the water of the Nile into blood; for this also was imitated by the Chartumim, although they were, on the other hand, unable to restore the sound water of the Nile. After seven days follows the second plague; frogs fill, with their loathsome presence, all houses and apartments; the learned of Egypt also certainly produce these animals, but they cannot remove them, and Pharaoh is now forced, for the first time, to humiliate himself so far as to implore, through Moses, the assistance of the God of Israel, whom he had, shortly before derided as an illusion and a nonentity (viii. 4), and to promise the departure of the Israelites for the purpose represented by Moses. But he scarcely saw himself delivered from the mischief of the frogs, when he unscrupulously retracted his solemn permission. The next plague, that of the gnats, reduced the antagonists of Moses to a more difficult position. Even the sorcerers confessed: "this is the finger of God;" for they were even not able to produce these insects, much less to remove them (viii. 15); yet Pharaoh persevered in his contumacy. The fourth plague—the beetles—forced from Pharaoh the permission that Israel might sacrifice to their God *in Egypt*. But when Moses represented to him that they would not be safe from the religious fanaticism of the Egyptian people, if they killed animals held in sacred veneration by the latter, Pharaoh gave the hypocritical promise, to allow their departure into the desert, with the restriction, however, not to proceed too far from the Egyptian frontier (verse 24); and although Moses was fully convinced of Pharaoh's insincerity (verse 25), he prayed to God to let the plague cease, which, in fact, disappeared immediately. More destructive and more fatal chastisements, were now accumulated against Pharaoh; a pestilence annihilated the greatest part of the Egyptian cattle, whilst that of the Israelites remained uninjured—but Pharaoh persisted in his obstinacy. More dreadful than all preceding calamities was the sixth plague, that of boils; it was no longer directed against the property, but the persons of the Egyptians; and what caused still greater horror was the circumstance that the ulcerating boils covered even the pure bodies of the scrupulously cleanly priests, a fact which the text expressly mentions (ix. 11). But even this punishment exercised no effect upon Pharaoh's conduct. A terrible hail-storm followed, accompanied with torrents of rain, and crashing thunder, and fearful lightnings; the unbridled fury of the elements, before unheard of in Egypt, killed men and beasts in the fields, and destroyed every herb and every tree, and annihilated the earlier crops, as flax and barley—Goshen alone, the abode of the Israelites,

remained exempt from all these inflictions. They were, certainly, so overpowering, that Pharaoh summoned Moses and Aaron before him, and confessed: "I have sinned this time; God is just, but I and my people are wicked" (ix. 27); he requested them to pray for him, and promised again to allow the departure of the Israelites. However, when he was released from this plague also, he hardened his heart as before. But although all these chastisements had apparently remained fruitless to reform *Pharaoh's* mind, they exercised a powerful influence upon the feelings of the Egyptian *people*, who began to see the power of the Lord, and to acknowledge it; for already at the seventh plague, a great part had followed the warning, to drive the cattle from the fields into the houses, before the commencement of the hail-storm; and when Moses now announced, as a new plague, the infliction of formidable, unparalleled swarms of devastating locusts, the people urged the king to submissiveness, reproachfully warning him: "Dost thou not yet know that Egypt is ruined?" (x. 7). But when Moses insisted upon the departure of the *whole* people, with their wives and children, and all their cattle, Pharaoh felt, as an undoubted fact, what he had hitherto but vaguely guessed, namely, that the sacrifices in the desert were only used as a pretext to conceal the plan of a total emigration from Egypt; and shunning the idea of voluntarily depriving himself of the services of so many vigorous and active labourers, he expelled Moses and Aaron from his presence (verse 11). The east-wind brought the threatened numberless locust swarms; in a short time they converted the flourishing fields of Egypt into deserted tracts; the horrors of a famine glared in the face of the unhappy country; then Pharaoh called once more Moses and Aaron, and confessed: "I have sinned against the Lord your God, *and against you*" (x. 16). Moses prayed to God; a west-wind rose, and buried the hosts of the locusts in the Red Sea—but Pharaoh hardened his heart anew. The ninth plague ensued, more calculated to fill the minds of the Egyptians with awe and terror, than to cause actual destruction; but it was a worthy preparation for the terrible visitation which still awaited the unfortunate

---

14 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה כָּבֵד לֵב פַּרְעֹה מֵאֵן לְשַׁלַּח הָעָם׃
15 לֵךְ אֶל־פַּרְעֹה בַּבֹּקֶר הִנֵּה יֹצֵא הַמַּיְמָה וְנִצַּבְתָּ לִקְרָאתוֹ עַל־
שְׂפַת הַיְאֹר וְהַמַּטֶּה אֲשֶׁר־נֶהְפַּךְ לְנָחָשׁ תִּקַּח בְּיָדֶךָ׃ 16 וְאָמַרְתָּ

First Plague. Blood. (דם). Ver. 14—25.

14. God gives Moses the command for the first plague (ver. 14—18), distinctly stating the reason, because "Pharaoh's heart is hardened." כבד is here the verb, not the adjective (as Rashi and Kimchi assert). Onkelos renders, therefore, correctly אתיקר, and Jonathan איתקף, like ויחזק in the preceding verse.

15. *Lo, he goeth out to the water*, namely, the Nile. It is known, that it was customary with the kings of Egypt in June and July, when the Nile rises, to repair, in pompous procession, to the river, to convince themselves how many degrees it has risen; for the due increase of the Nile in that season is the only guarantee for a fruitful year and an abundant harvest. Ebn Ezra and others believe, therefore, that it was for this occasion that Pharaoh went to the Nile. But the first wonder took place in the beginning of the year (see on ver. 20), when the rising of the Nile could not, in natural course, be expected. Besides, the same phrase is used in the announcement of the fourth plague a considerable time later (viii. 16), where the same commentator explains: "It is the custom of kings to walk in the morning at the river's side, for the sight of the water is wholesome to the eyes": similar to the

people, and which should, at last, break the king's contumacy. After Pharaoh had permitted the people to depart, with their wives and children, only wishing to keep back their cattle as a pledge of their return, and after Moses had determinedly rejected this proposal, the king took the firm and unshaken resolution rather to suffer extreme ruin than to lose a nation of useful slaves; he forbade Moses, on punishment of death, ever again to appear before him, and, after the latter had predicted to him the last calamity, the death of all first-born of man and cattle, he left the king, in high excitement at his refractoriness. In the night of the 14th of the month of Nisan, pestilence raged with awful havoc in Egypt; Pharaoh, shaken and terrified by the death of so many, and of the most respected of his people, and of so numerous sacred animals, called again Moses and Aaron; he pressed the people to depart without delay—and the Israelites went laden with rich treasures, from a country which had been to them, for centuries, "an iron furnace of misery." But scarcely had the proud heart of Pharaoh recovered from the first terror, when he publicly repented his untimely compliance; he condemned it as abject weakness; and, at the head of his formidable and well-practised army, he pursued the Israelites to the Red Sea; and the king and his hosts were devoured by the roaring depths.—This is a brief outline of the grand struggle between a proud king and the Lord of Heaven and Earth; between the fear and obduracy of a heart in which the germ of sin had taken too deep roots to be eradicated without the most unusual moral energy, and it was this moral energy which the haughty monarch could not command. But Moses appears already, in that skillfully delineated picture, as a devoted servant of God, full of humility and modesty, but also distinguished by skill and intrepidity.

ויחזק is here intransitive, his heart was or remained hardened, not as the English Version renders: "and he (God) hardened Pharaoh's heart" (Onkelos, ואיתקף לבא; Jonathan, ואיתקף יצרא דלבא). See on viii. 11.

---

14. And the Lord said to Moses, Pharaoh's heart is hardened; he refuseth to let the people go. 15. Go to Pharaoh in the morning—behold, he goeth out to the water—and thou shalt stand by the river's brink [1]before him; and the [2]staff which was turned into a serpent shalt thou take into thy hand. 16. And thou shalt say to

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Against he come. [2] Rod.

remark of Rashbam on our passage: "he went out, as distinguished personages use to do, to take a walk or a ride." Either this was the reason of Pharaoh's visit to the Nile, or the intention to bathe (ii. 5), or, which is as probable, to offer to the Nile, which was worshipped with divine honours, the ordinary morning-sacrifice; and it would imply a peculiar point and force to suppose, that the true God manifested His power on the Nile, just when Pharaoh intended to do homage to the false deity. The Nile was in many parts of Egypt worshipped as a God from the remotest times; he had a magnificent temple in Nilopolis; Herodotus (ii. 90) speaks of the priests of the Nile; it was a very ancient opinion, that the Nile is identical with Osiris, that it is the supreme deity of the land, and that it is the *rival of heaven*, since it watered the country without the aid of clouds or rain (compare Herod. ii. 111). Ancient writers, as well as the monuments, testify to these facts. Even now the Nile is called by the Moslems "the most holy river," in acknowledgment of the paramount benefits it bestows by fertilizing the

אֵלָיו יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הָעִבְרִים שְׁלָחַנִי אֵלֶיךָ לֵאמֹר שַׁלַּח אֶת־עַמִּי
וְיַעַבְדֻנִי בַּמִּדְבָּר וְהִנֵּה לֹא־שָׁמַעְתָּ עַד־כֹּה׃ 17 כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה
בְּזֹאת תֵּדַע כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי מַכֶּה ׀ בַּמַּטֶּה אֲשֶׁר־בְּיָדִי
עַל־הַמַּיִם אֲשֶׁר בַּיְאֹר וְנֶהֶפְכוּ לְדָם׃ 18 וְהַדָּגָה אֲשֶׁר־בַּיְאֹר תָּמוּת
וּבָאַשׁ הַיְאֹר וְנִלְאוּ מִצְרַיִם לִשְׁתּוֹת מַיִם מִן־הַיְאֹר׃ ס 19 וַיֹּאמֶר
יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה אֱמֹר אֶל־אַהֲרֹן קַח מַטְּךָ וּנְטֵה־יָדְךָ

country.—Moses was to stand לקראתו so that he could not but meet him, i. e., to await there his arrival. "Moses is ordered to take this opportunity to speak to the king, because he had not free access to the palace," observes Rosenmüller; however, we have proofs of the contrary (see on v. 15), and Moses was to meet Pharaoh at the Nile, in order to perform there the miracles at once before his eyes.

17. *In this thou shalt know that I am the Lord*, evidently with reference to the bold and wanton exclamation of Pharaoh (v. 2): "I know not the Lord."—*Behold, I will smite*, said Moses, the subject being changed.—*And they* (the waters) *shall be turned into blood.* Rosenmüller remarks: "They shall assume a red colour, so that they have the appearance of blood," as in Joel iii. 4: "And the moon shall be converted (יֵהָפֵךְ) into blood" (so also Gerlach, Hengstenb., and others). But this opinion is utterly inadmissible on account of the effects of that transmutation stated in ver. 18. Besides the poetical diction of a prophet can prove nothing for the plain historical style of our narrative. From the same reason the analogy of 2 Kings iii. 22, is equally inappropriate; and Josephus (Antiq. II., xiv. 2) remarks expressly: "The Egyptian river ran with bloody water at the command of God, insomuch that it could not be drunk;....for the water was not only of the *colour* of blood, but it brought upon those who ventured to drink it great pains and bitter torment" (compare note on iv. 9).—The very first plague manifestly symbolizes the reckless bloodshed of Pharaoh and his ultimate sanguinary punishment, and was thus a most powerful admonition for the king to discontinue his cruelties, and to obey the voice of God's messengers (see Book of Wisdom, xi. 6, 7: "At the sight of the bloody Nile the Egyptians were with horror reminded of Pharaoh's murderous command against the Hebrew children").

18. *And the fish that is in the river shall die.* About the abundance of fish in the Nile we possess the unanimous and most decided testimonials both of ancient and modern geographers and travellers. Diodorus Siculus (i. 36) says: "The Nile abounds in all kinds of fish (παντοῖα γένη) in incredible numbers; for it supplies the Egyptians not only with copious food of fresh fish, but enables them to salt quantities for exportation; for which purpose they used fossil salt from the African deserts, not sea salt, which like everything belonging to the sea was abhorred by them." (Compare Num. xi. 5; Isaiah xix. 8; Herod. ii. 93; Strabo xvii. 823; Aelian x. 43; see *Oedmann*, Miscell. i. p. 136; Baehr on Herod. i. p. 658). By the dying of the fish, therefore, the Egyptians, who live on them in a great measure, and some classes, and some districts almost exclusively, were deprived of a very important portion of their subsistence. This physical infliction was greatly enhanced by a more spiritual, religious mortification; for "the river was offensive in smell"; the Nile, which was to them an object of profound worship, (see on ver. 15), was now to be for them an object of abomination: they will fly its vicinity. Even the fish of the Nile were

him, The Lord God of the Hebrews hath sent me to thee, saying, Let my people go, that they may serve me in the desert: and behold, hitherto thou wouldst not hear.
17. Thus saith the Lord, In this thou shalt know that I *am* the Lord. Behold, I will smite with the staff that *is* in my hand upon the waters which *are* in the river, and they shall be turned into blood.
18. And the fish that *is* in the river shall die, and the river shall be offensive in smell; and the Egyptians shall loathe to drink of the water of the river.
19. And the Lord spoke to Moses,

in some degree esteemed sacred. They were in some parts worshipped as deities, and hence the priests scrupulously abstained from eating fish. A third calamity accompanying this plague is the impossibility of drinking the water of the Nile, a vexation the keener felt by them, because the water of the Nile, after having been purified from the slime by a kind of almond-dough is, on the one hand, most agreeable, tasteful and healthy, so that it appears to strangers almost as an artificially prepared drink—whence the Egyptian proverb originated: "the water of the Nile is as sweet as honey and sugar," and the adage, "that if Mohammed had drunk of it, he would have besought God to be immortal, that he might always enjoy it"; and it is, on the other hand, the *only* drinkable water which the inhabitants can possibly use; for, says Maillet (i. p. 20): "The well and cistern-water in Egypt is detestable and unwholesome; fountains are so rare, that they are a kind of prodigy in that country; and as to rain-water, that is out of the question, as scarcely any rain falls in Egypt" (compare *Josephus* Antiq. II. xiv. 1, *καὶ πηγὴν ἑτέραν ὑδάτων οὐκ ἔχουσιν*).—נלאו Niphil of לאה, to be weary of something (Isaiah i. 14; Jeremiah vi. 11), followed by the infinitive; therefore to *loathe* a thing. The Egyptians will have an aversion to that water, which had always been their delight, and which they were accustomed to consider as a peculiar blessing to the country, not to be met with in any other part of the globe. Rashi takes לאה less appropriately here in the meaning of "to take pains for something," and explains: "they will exert themselves in vain to find a remedy for the water of the Nile to make it palatable." Similarly Glaire: "et se fatigueront en vain pour boire." Targum Jonathan: וישתלהון; the Sept.: "The Egyptians will not *be able* to drink of the water of the river"; so also Ebn Ezra (see ver. 21).—The Samaritan codex of the Pentateuch has after this verse the words: וילך משה ואהרן אל פרעה ויאמרו אליו, "And Moses and Aaron went to Pharaoh, and said to him," and repeats then ver. 16, 17, 18, an explicitness, which, although not against the style of the Pentateuch (see ver. 9—12), is not necessarily demanded by it (see iv. 12, 20—30; vi. 9; vii. 26—29; and viii. 1, 16—19, 20).

19. All the waters of Egypt (על־מימי מצרים) which were to be turned into blood, are distinctly specified in the following expressions. The Nile divides itself near Kairo into different *arms* and *mouths*, separately flowing into the Mediterranean; and these are the נהרות. The ancients knew seven mouths (viz., the Heracleotic, Balbitic, Sebennitic, Phatnitic or Bucolic, Mendesian, Tanitic, and Pelusian); whence the Nile was called septemfluus or septemgeminus (*Ovid*, Metamorphoses xv. 753; *Virgil*, Æneid, vi. 800). At present they are partly buried in the sand, and partly they do not contain water throughout the whole year. But tributary rivers the

עַל־מֵימֵי מִצְרַיִם עַל־נַהֲרֹתָם עַל־יְאֹרֵיהֶם וְעַל־אַגְמֵיהֶם וְעַל
כָּל־מִקְוֵה מֵימֵיהֶם וְיִהְיוּ־דָם וְהָיָה דָם בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וּבָעֵצִים
וּבָאֲבָנִים׃ 20 וַיַּעֲשׂוּ־כֵן מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָֹה וַיָּרֶם
בַּמַּטֶּה וַיַּךְ אֶת־הַמַּיִם אֲשֶׁר בַּיְאֹר לְעֵינֵי פַרְעֹה וּלְעֵינֵי עֲבָדָיו
וַיֵּהָפְכוּ כָּל־הַמַּיִם אֲשֶׁר־בַּיְאֹר לְדָם׃ 21 וְהַדָּגָה אֲשֶׁר־בַּיְאֹר

Nile has none, in its whole extent of 1,350 nautical miles; a solitary instance in the hydographic history of the globe.—From the Nile and its arms the water was, for the purpose of artificial irrigation of the fields, from the earliest times, conducted through the different parts of the country by means of *canals* and *trenches*, which are called יארים (Septuagint διώρυγας; Rashi correctly: "canals dug by human hands from the Nile to fertilize the fields"). After the inundation of the Nile there remain near its shores numerous *ponds*, *marshes*, and *pools*, and these are the אגמים (see Isaiah xlii. 15). This term may also include *the lakes* of Egypt, partly the work of nature, partly artificially formed, serving as great receptacles of water, in which at the rising of the Nile the superfluous water was collected and preserved for future use. Rashi explains justly *stagnant waters*, and adds as a translation אשטנק étangs, lakes. Such lakes, as those famous under the name of Moeris and Mareotis, are mostly overgrown with reeds (whence אגמים has also this latter signification, Jeremiah li. 32), and full of fowl and fish. The מקוה מים, lastly, are all wells, and especially water-reservoirs or cisterns, such as are found near houses or mosques. Such large cistern was formerly in Alexandria, into which the water was led through a canal constructed for the purpose, and which supplied the town with drinkable water throughout the year (see Thevenot i. p. 173).—The Stat. constr. of מים is מֵי, which form is, however, sometimes doubled into מֵימֵי (see *Ewald*, Critical Gram. p. 508, note).—*Both in vessels of wood and in vessels of stone*; and quite so translates Onkelos. The Egyptians keep the water of the Nile in vessels of wood, or more frequently of clay and stone, especially for the purpose of filtration, so necessary in consequence of the many heterogeneous and impure parts it originally contains (*Jerom.* on Isaiah xxiii 3; *Pococke*, Orient i. 312; *Burckhardt*, Travels ii. 778). Thus it is emphatically announced, that the water would be converted into blood *throughout all the land of Egypt*, even that which was already in the houses of the Egyptians. The literal translation of the Hebrew words here used is: "in woods and in stones," which is certainly obscure, and would almost be unintelligible, if we did not consider, that this whole account is written by a native Egyptian, and for a people, every member of which was perfectly familiar with all the customs and usages of that country.

20, 21. In the 20th verse the infliction of the first plague is plainly expressed: *And all the waters in the river were turned into blood*; and in the subsequent verse its effects are as clearly described, perfectly in harmony with ver. 18.—*He lifted up*, namely, Aaron, which the Sept. adds (see ver. 19). רום in Hiphil is here intransitive, to start up; De Wette aptly: "und er fuhr in die Höhe mit dem Stabe."—Proceeding from the principle laid down as the general character of the Egyptian wonders, that they have a certain obvious connection with apparent natural phenomena, aggrandized to a prodigious extent (see p. 118), we observe, that according to the unanimous descriptions of geographers, the water of the Nile, annually towards the end of the month of June, when the river rises,

Say to Aaron, Take thy [1]staff, and stretch out thy hand upon the waters of Egypt, upon their streams, upon their [2]canals, and upon their ponds, and upon all the [3]gatherings of water, *that* they may become blood; and *that* there may be blood throughout all the land of Egypt, both in *vessels of* wood and in *vessels of* stone. 20. And Moses and Aaron did so, as the Lord had commanded; and he lifted up the [1]staff, and smote the waters that *were* in the river, before the eyes of Pharaoh, and before the eyes of his servants; and all the waters that *were* in the river were turned into blood. 21. And the fish that *was* in the

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Rod. [2] Rivers. [3] Pools.

changes for about twenty days its colour, which is usually dark and almost black (wherefore the Nile is poetically called שיחור "the *black* river," Isaiah xxiii. 3; Jeremiah ii. 18; and by Greek writers, Μέλας, *Serv.* on *Virg.*, Geo. iv. 291), and assumes a red appearance, which gradually passes into a greenish colour; and thus during this time the water of the Nile has a disagreeable smell, and an unwholesome taste, although it is not always absolutely undrinkable; whilst in some years it is exceedingly loathsome and unhealthy. (See *Oedman*, Collect. Miscell. i. 142; *Pococke*, Orient i. 296, 312; Déscript. de l'Egypte xviii. 571; *Fel. Faber*, Trav. i. 325; *Maillet*, i. 71). Similar phenomena are reported of other rivers also; for instance, the Tigris (*Barhebr.* Chron. p. 346), which is said to have streamed with blood (sanguinem fluxisse); further of the river Adonis (now called Nahar Ibrahim), coming from the Lebanon, which imparts for a considerable distance a red colour even to the sea into which it flows (*Maundrell*, Trav. p. 35; see also *Vogel's* Annals of Leipsic, p. 460, where it is narrated that the water of the Elster appeared during four days, from the 15th to the 19th of October, 1631, red like blood). Ehrenberg found the whole bay of the Red Sea in the vicinity of Mount Sinai appearing like blood, in consequence of cryptogamic plants abounding in that part of the sea. By others the redness is ascribed to the particles of red clay, which the Nile, at its rising, carries with it from Ethiopia (so *Pococke*, *Maillet*, *Maundrell*, *Le Père aîné*), or to the innumerable little red insects which fill the Nile about that season.—Now, the *wonder* recorded in our text consists in the following circumstances: 1. That this event did not take place in June, in natural course, but in the beginning of the year. For the hail mentioned in ix. 31, destroyed the flax and barley. These crops are in Egypt generally ripe for harvest in April; but the rise of the Nile does not begin in so early a part of the year; and certainly the rapid sketch of the plagues delineated in the holy text, obliges us to suppose that all ten inflictions took place in the same year; for they must have followed in quick succession if they were to arouse the undivided attention of the king, and to strike terror into his heart. 2. That the plague took place on the command of God through Moses; 3. That the Nile did not merely assume a red or bloody *colour*, but was totally converted into blood (see on ver. 17); 4. That all fish died; whilst ordinarily this does not take place at the change of the colour of the Nile (the opinion of Eichhorn to the contrary is a perfectly unfounded assertion); 5. That even the water which was in the vessels was affected by the plague (ver. 19);

מֵתָה וַיִּבְאַשׁ הַיְאֹר וְלֹא־יָכְלוּ מִצְרַיִם לִשְׁתּוֹת מַיִם מִן־הַיְאֹר
וַיְהִי הַדָּם בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 22 וַיַּעֲשׂוּ־כֵן חַרְטֻמֵּי מִצְרַיִם
בְּלָטֵיהֶם וַיֶּחֱזַק לֵב־פַּרְעֹה וְלֹא־שָׁמַע אֲלֵהֶם כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה׃
23 וַיִּפֶן פַּרְעֹה וַיָּבֹא אֶל־בֵּיתוֹ וְלֹא־שָׁת לִבּוֹ גַּם־לָזֹאת׃
24 וַיַּחְפְּרוּ כָל־מִצְרַיִם סְבִיבֹת הַיְאֹר מַיִם לִשְׁתּוֹת כִּי לֹא יָכְלוּ
לִשְׁתֹּת מִמֵּימֵי הַיְאֹר׃ 25 וַיִּמָּלֵא שִׁבְעַת יָמִים אַחֲרֵי הַכּוֹת־
יְהוָה אֶת־הַיְאֹר׃ פ

6. That Israelites enjoyed pure water during the calamity; for, according to ver. 24, the Egyptians only dug after wells; and Josephus remarks distinctly: "The water of the Nile was disagreeable and unwholesome to the Egyptians, whilst it was sweet and palatable to the Hebrews, nor in any way different from its natural quality"; and Targum Jonathan adds, on ver. 22, that the Egyptian magicians took water *from Goshen* for their experiment; and 7. That the change lasted only seven days, whilst travellers maintain, that it usually extends during twenty days and more. In 1673 it retained the red colour from the beginning of July to the end of December. See *Hartman*, Egypt, p. 128. Compare, however *Abarbanel* on ver. 25, and *Hengstenberg*, Moses and Egypt, p. 106, who connect, less probably, ver. 25 closely with ver. 26, and assert that the text simply intimates, that seven days after the beginning of the first plague, concerning the conclusion of which nothing is stated in the text, the second was announced.— Perfectly inadmissible is, therefore, the opinion of Eichhorn, that this, like all other signs of Moses, is literally nothing more than the natural annual occurrence; and that Moses, in order to impress Pharaoh with the extraordinary power bestowed upon him by the Almighty God of the Hebrews, took some water from the Nile, changed it by some chemical contrivance into a red colour, and exhorted Pharaoh, that the same God, by whose aid he had now converted the water before him into a bloody fluid, produced every year the similar effect upon all the water of the Nile. But 1. the dying of the fish in the Nile would be inexplicable; 2. this would merely have been a harmless and innocuous *sign* (like that related in iv. 9. for the justification of Moses), whilst it is intended as a *plague* (ver. 4); and 3. according to the sacred text not a vessel filled with water, but the whole Nile underwent the fatal change.

22. *And the Egyptian interpreters of secret signs did so with their hidden arts* (בלטיהם, see on ver. 11). Ebn Ezra already asks: "From where did the magicians take water for the performance of their experiment, as *all* the water had been converted into blood ?" (ver. 20), and he answers, that Aaron changed only the water *above* the earth, not that *beneath* it; and so they might dig for water in the earth, as the Egyptians did for the purpose of finding drinkable water (ver. 24). Besides, there was, in Goshen, the district of the Hebrews, water which was not affected by the plague, and Targum Jonathan says here, distinctly, that the magicians took the water from Goshen; see on ver. 20, No. 6. Others (as Hengstenberg and Gerlach) assert, with less plausibility, that the word *all* (in ver. 20) is not to be taken quite literally. Nor can we accede to the opinion of many interpreters, among whom is Ebn Ezra, that the Hebrews were likewise smitten with the plagues of blood, the frogs, gnats, boils and locusts, "because they were not so dangerous and

[1]river died, and the river was offensive in smell, and the Egyptians could not drink of the water of the river, and there was blood throughout all the land of Egypt. 22. And the Egyptian [2]interpreters of secret signs did so with their [3]hidden arts: and Pharaoh's heart was hardened, and he did not hearken to them, as the Lord had said. 23. And Pharaoh turned and went into his house, neither did he direct his heart to this also. 24. And all the Egyptians digged round about the river for water to drink; for they could not drink of the water of the river. 25. And seven days were fulfilled after the Lord had smitten the river.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Water. [2] Magicians. [3] Enchantments.

fatal as the rest." But still they were *plagues*, intended and calculated to terrify and annoy Pharaoh and the Egyptians, and how should the Israelites, *in whose favour* these punishments were inflicted upon their adversaries, have suffered the same calamities as the latter? Still less acceptable is the opinion of Clericus, Philippson, and others, that Moses and Aaron, after having converted the water into blood, changed it again into its original condition and colour, in order to afford to the magicians an opportunity for displaying their arts. There is, further, that important and essential difference between the miracles of Moses, and the feats of the magicians, that, whilst the former converted the water of the whole Nile, with all its arms and canals, and permanently changing floods, even where he could not see it, and made it remain in this state for at least seven days (ver. 25); the latter were only able to produce a similar effect upon a very small quantity of stagnant water, which they had before their eyes in a vessel, and which remained so only during the few moments of the experiment, until the king returned home (ver. 23). It is further to be remarked, that although the magicians changed the water into blood, they could not convert the blood again into water.—*And Pharaoh's heart was hardened*, etc., see on verse 13.

23. *Neither did he direct his heart to this also* (גם־לזאת), referring to the first sign of Aaron's serpent devouring the serpents of the magicians. The feminine זאת is used for the indefinite gender, or the neuter. Maurer: "Et ne ad hoc (haec) quidem animum suum adjecit."

24. *And the Egyptians digged for water*, not the Hebrews; see on verses 20 (No. 6) and 22. The water, which the Hebrews kept in their own *vessels of wood and vessels of stone* (see on ver. 19), might have remained untouched by the plague, and this supply probably sufficed for seven days (ver. 25). Thus is easily removed the objection of Drusius (acknowledged by Rosenmüller), why it was necessary to dig after water, if that of the Hebrews was not vitiated, as the latter lived together with the Egyptians in the same districts and towns, in which, therefore, the plague did not prevail, whence it follows, that not the *whole* country was affected by the calamity, against the express words of Moses.—The Septuagint takes מים לשתות, together, ὥστε πιεῖν ὕδωρ, "in order to drink water," in strict accordance with the Masoretic signs. The same version renders here כִּי with καί, obscuring thereby the logical connection of the sentence. Jonathan, in order to enhance the miracle, adds: "but they did not find clear water." However it was a sufficient

26 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה בֹּא אֶל־פַּרְעֹה וְאָמַרְתָּ אֵלָיו כֹּה אָמַר
יְהוָה שַׁלַּח אֶת־עַמִּי וְיַעַבְדֻנִי׃ 27 וְאִם־מָאֵן אַתָּה לְשַׁלֵּחַ הִנֵּה
אָנֹכִי נֹגֵף אֶת־כָּל־גְּבוּלְךָ בַּצְפַרְדְּעִים׃ 28 וְשָׁרַץ הַיְאֹר צְפַרְדְּעִים
וְעָלוּ וּבָאוּ בְּבֵיתֶךָ וּבַחֲדַר מִשְׁכָּבְךָ וְעַל־מִטָּתֶךָ וּבְבֵית עֲבָדֶיךָ

punishment for them to be deprived, during seven days, of the delightful waters of the Nile, and to content themselves with the very disagreable and thick waters of the Egyptian wells (see ver. 18).

25. *And seven days were fulfilled after the Lord had smitten the river.* These words evidently describe the duration of the first plague, a statement not made with reference to any of the subsequent inflictions. Luther translates here, the most distinctly: "Und das währte sieben Tage lang dass der Herr den Strom schlug;" and Targum Onkelos adds: "and afterwards the word of the Lord remedied the river." Abarbanel gives, besides, three other explanations: 1st. These words are added to show the refractoriness of Pharaoh, who was not, even by the continuance of the plague during so protracted a time, forced to obedience and humility;—2nd. They indicate the long-suffering of God, who allowed Pharaoh rest during seven days after the first plague, in order to grant him time for reflection and repentance;—3rd. They are to be connected with the following verse: Seven days after the change of the Nile God announced to Pharaoh the second plague: so that the first calamity might have lasted even longer than seven days (compare vi. 28, 29): which interpretation is also adopted by Eichhorn, Hengstenberg, Gerlach, and others, desirous to bring into agreement the natural and usual change of the Nile, generally extending during at least twenty days, with the facts here related; see however, on ver. 20, No. 7.

SECOND PLAGUE. FROGS (צפרדע). VII. 26.—VIII. 11.

26. *Go to Pharaoh,* namely, with thy brother Aaron.

27. *And if thou refuse to let them go;* for עמי or אתם, is to be supplied; see on ii. 3. מָאֵן, is, according to Kimchi and Rashi, the participle Piel, instead of מְמָאֵן, like שַׁבֵּחַ אני, in Eccl. iv. 2. In Jerem. xiii. 10 occurs the plural מֵאֲנִים, see our note on iii. 2, ad אֻכָּל. The root נגף implies the notion of smiting inimically or hurtfully, not, however, always *fatally.*—צפרדע, composed, perhaps, of צפר, *to leap,* and רדע (Arabic, ردع), *pool;* therefore, an animal "leaping in pools," that is, *frog;* Rashi, "grenouilles." That it cannot be a crocodile, as some Hebrew commentators have maintained, is sufficiently explained by *Bochart,* Hieroz. ii., Book v. 2; and, in fact, a plague of crocodiles would have manifested itself in quite a different and a more formidable manner than is described in our text; it would perfectly destroy the gradual climax of the wonders, and would be appropriate rather as the ninth than as the second plague.

28, 29. *And the river shall teem with frogs.* שרץ being a verb signifying fulness or abundance, is construed with the accusative, which is, in such connections, merely the supplement describing the objects in which the abundance consists, compare Gen. i. 21; ix. 2.—*And they shall come up,* namely, from the Nile, which was considered lying lower than the town.—*And in thy ovens.* So great was the number of frogs, that they penetrated into the dryest places, which they otherwise avoid, and in which, if found there by the Egyptians, they must have excited the greatest disgust. The proper baking-ovens (תנור), which are generally for public use in Oriental cities, are little different from ours. But, in remoter times already, were also used large

26. And the Lord spoke to Moses: Go to Pharaoh, and
say to him, Thus saith the Lord, Let my people go, that
they may serve me. 27. And if thou refuse to let *them*
go, behold, I shall smite all thy boundaries with frogs.
28. And the river shall teem *with* frogs, and they shall
come up and enter into thy house, and into thy bed-
chamber, and upon thy bed, and into the house of thy
servants, and upon thy people, and into thy ovens, and

earthen pots, open at the top, about three feet high. A fire is lighted within, generally with wood; then, if the sides are sufficiently heated, the dough is affixed to them from without, and the aperture above covered. Such a pot is still called by the Arabs תנור (تنور). At present, the following is the usual mode of making bread among the Arab tribes which remain for a longer time in the same place: "They make rude ovens by digging a hole about three feet deep, shaping it like a reversed funnel, and plastering it with mud. They heat it by burning brushwood within, and then stick the lumps of dough, pressed into small cakes almost half an inch thick, to the sides, with the hand. The bread is ready in two or three minutes. . . . . All Arab bread is unleavened" (*Layard*, Discoveries in Nineveh and Babylon, p. 288). *Kneading-trough*, משארת, from שְׂאֹר = שְׂאֹר, leaven, and the מ *formativum*, denoting the place where it is used. *Gesenius*, Thes. ii. pp. 1351, derives it from the verb שָׂאַר, in the signification, to swell up, to ferment (see xii. 34).—בכה =בך; Targum Jonathan ובנופך ובגופי עמך. The Samaritan codex has here again unnecessarily, like after verse 18, the words: "and Moses and Aaron came to Pharaoh, and they said to him, Thus speaks the Lord," and then it repeats from verse 26—29.—If we compare the respective effects of the two first plagues, it is evident that the second is of a far more tormenting and calamitous nature. For whilst during the first plague the Egyptians had at least water from the wells, however inferior this is to that of the Nile, the frogs filled not only the rivers and all waters—*thus including the first plague*—they not only infested the streets and houses of the Egyptians, but they molested even their persons, penetrated into their bed-chambers, and disturbed their sleep. If we add hereto, that, under such circumstances, even the water must have been singularly loathsome; that the whole atmosphere must have been infected with a fetid smell; that the incessant inharmonious noise dinned perpetually in the ears, allowing them no rest either by day or night; that Pharaoh humbled himself so far as to request Moses and Aaron to pray for the removal of the plague, and to promise the release of the Israelites, and that even the destruction of those animals was attended with a pestilential odour: it will be easily conceived that there is a gradation even in the two first plagues, overwhelming enough to convince even a haughty and obstinate tyrant with what powerful Being he had madly engaged in warfare, and what chastisements were still in reserve against his refractoriness. That frogs can, by their number, become a plague, is confirmed by several ancient writers, as Just. xv. 2, who relates, that the Autariatae were compelled to leave their abodes because the frogs had multiplied to a prodigious amount, and Phaenias, a disciple of Aristotle, writes thus, on a similar case: "In Paeonia and Dardania appeared once, suddenly, such numbers of frogs, that they filled the houses and streets. Therefore, as killing them, or shutting the doors, was of no

וּבְעַמֶּךָ וּבְתַנּוּרֶיךָ וּבְמִשְׁאֲרוֹתֶיךָ׃ 29 וּבְכָה וּבְעַמְּךָ וּבְכָל־עֲבָדֶיךָ
יַעֲלוּ הַצְפַרְדְּעִים׃

books, and wool-stuffs, increased in a miraculous degree. A trustworthy man assured me that these animals ate and spoiled 1,500 pieces of his stuffs, being more than fifteen camel loads. I convinced myself, by ocular inspection, that this statement was not exaggerated, and that the worms, in the vicinity of the sea, had destroyed a great quantity of wood and stuffs. I saw, near Matariah, garden-walls quite perforated by these little animals. About the year 821 this plague appeared in the district of Hosainiah, near Kairo. The worms, after having destroyed the provisions, the furniture, etc.

avail, as even the vessels were full of them, the water infested, and the food uneatable, as they could scarcely set their feet on the ground without treading on heaps of them, and as they were vexed by the smell of the great numbers which died, they fled from that region, as is reported" (*Eusthatius* in Hom. Il. A. p. 35); compare Pliny, viii. 43; Aelian, xvii. 41. We subjoin an interesting description of a similar plague, which occurred in Egypt, from Quatremère, i. p. 121, who follows an account of Macrizi: "In the year 791, and in the subsequent years, the reptiles fatal to

ח 1 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה אֱמֹר אֶל־אַהֲרֹן נְטֵה אֶת־יָדְךָ בְּמַטֶּךָ
עַל־הַנְּהָרֹת עַל־הַיְאֹרִים וְעַל־הָאֲגַמִּים וְהַעַל אֶת־הַצְפַרְדְּעִים עַל־
אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 2 וַיֵּט אַהֲרֹן אֶת־יָדוֹ עַל מֵימֵי מִצְרָיִם וַתַּעַל

CHAPTER VIII.

1. See on vii. 19. *Stretch forth thy hand with the staff*; merely as a symbolical sign, that the frogs would come up from the waters of Egypt. Septuag.: *ἔκτεινον τῇ χειρί σου τὴν ῥάβδον σου.*

2. *And the frogs came up.* צפרדע, used collectively, and therefore construed with the feminine (ותעל). Compare note on v. 16, to וחטאת עמך. The Septuagint translates incorrectly, *καὶ ἀνήγαγε τοὺς βατράχους*; and adds, besides, *καὶ ἀνεβιβάσθη ὁ βάτραχος*—corresponding probably with the Hebrew ותכבד הצפרדע, and the frogs were heavy or numerous. Targum Jonathan concludes the verse with the following remark explanatory of the fact that Aaron, and not Moses performed the first wonders: "But Moses did not smite the river either with blood or frogs, because he had been rescued from it in his infancy, when he was exposed there by his mother."—*And they* (*the frogs*) *covered the land of Egypt.* It is universally known, that the Nile and all the waters supplied from it, especially the marshes, are exceedingly prolific in frogs, reptiles, and other organic animals, produced and fed by the rich and nutritious mud of the river, chiefly at the season when the "Green Nile" gives way to the "Red Nile." Thus the river, even in ordinary years, abounds in frogs, a fact which even our text (vers. 5, 7) mentions as known and acknowledged. One female lays, even in our regions, in the spring, 600 to 1100 eggs. Hasselquist (p. 254) reports, that at present also the inhabitants of Egypt are not unfrequently visited by an enormous increase of frogs, which torment them by their intrusion and their shrieking and yelling (see also Sonnini, iii. p. 365). But generally these animals are to a great extent destroyed by serpents, crocodiles, and storks, and this is one of the reasons, why the Ibis is revered as a sacred benefactor. But the facts related in our text manifest them-

into thy kneading-troughs. 29. And the frogs shall come up both upon thee and upon thy people, and upon all thy servants.

which caused to the inhabitants an incalculable loss, attacked the walls of the houses, and gnawed at the wood, and perforated it entirely. The proprietors hastily pulled down the houses, which had remained uninjured by the worms, so that this quarter was almost entirely desolated." From this account we may infer what vexation an excessive quantity of frogs might become; and this plague is here announced to Pharaoh; and the beginning of the following chapter relates its real occurrence; a punishment no doubt the more grievous to the Egyptians, as, according to some authorities, the frog was one of their sacred animals, although it has not been distinctly ascertained whether this superstition had its cause in their esteem for, or their dislike of that animal. It is, however, certain, that on very ancient hieroglyphic tablets, and on several ancient gems, the frog is represented sitting on the leaf of the sacred *lotus*, as a symbol either of the Nile, or of Osiris, the sun. The frogs stood under the authority of the goddess *Heki*, one of the supreme deities of Egypt, who was, in the time of Herodotus (ii. 155), worshipped in a magnificent shrine in the town Buto.

CHAP. VIII. 1. And the Lord said to Moses, Say to Aaron, Stretch forth thy hand with thy [1]staff over the streams, over the [2]canals, and over the ponds, and cause [3]the frogs to come up upon the land of Egypt. 2. And Aaron stretched forth his hand over the waters of Egypt, and the frogs

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Rod. [2] Rivers. [3] Frogs.

selves as a miracle in the following points: 1. The frogs came over the land at the command of Moses; 2. They appeared in such unparalleled multitudes, that they molested even the persons of the Egyptians; 3. They left their natural element, the water and its vicinity, and came into the houses and even the driest places (vii. 28); 4. The houses and persons of the Israelites were exempted from the plague (a fact evident from vii. 29, and viii. 5; compare on vii. 22); and 5. The frogs disappeared instantaneously and completely on the prayer of Moses (ver. 9; compare *Bochart*, Hieroz. p. 570).—Eichhorn, offering a similar explanation of this plague to that proposed by him with regard to the transmutation of the water of the Nile into blood (see on vii. 20, 21), asserts, that Moses, about the beginning of the month of July, when the frogs usually are so numerous in Egypt, that many of them are compelled to leave the water and to seek food elsewhere, called forth, "by an artifice unknown to us," a quantity of them from a neighbouring pond, assuring Pharaoh, that the same God, by whose assistance he had produced these few frogs, creates annually that vast number of these animals, which infests Egypt; which explanation, however, is not happier than that quoted and criticised on vii. 20, 21, or those ventured by the same critic about the following plagues.—A description of the different kinds of frogs in Egypt will be found in the "Déscription de l'Egypte," xxiv. p. 134, *et seq.* The most usual species in that country is the *rana punctata*, the dotted Egyptian frog; it is of ash colour, with green spots; the feet are marked with transverse bands, and the toes are separated to half their length. It is but seldom found in Europe.—In this, as in the following plagues, the humiliation is augmented by the contemptible

הַצְפַרְדֵּעַ וַתְּכַס אֶת־אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 3 וַיַּעֲשׂוּ־כֵן הַחַרְטֻמִּים בְּלָטֵיהֶם
וַיַּעֲלוּ אֶת־הַצְפַרְדְּעִים עַל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 4 וַיִּקְרָא פַרְעֹה לְמֹשֶׁה
וּלְאַהֲרֹן וַיֹּאמֶר הַעְתִּירוּ אֶל־יְהוָה וְיָסֵר הַצְפַרְדְּעִים מִמֶּנִּי וּמֵעַמִּי
וַאֲשַׁלְּחָה אֶת־הָעָם וְיִזְבְּחוּ לַיהוָה׃ 5 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה לְפַרְעֹה
הִתְפָּאֵר עָלַי לְמָתַי ׀ אַעְתִּיר לְךָ וְלַעֲבָדֶיךָ וּלְעַמְּךָ לְהַכְרִית הַצְפַרְדְּעִים
מִמְּךָ וּמִבָּתֶּיךָ רַק בַּיְאֹר תִּשָּׁאַרְנָה׃ 6 וַיֹּאמֶר לְמָחָר וַיֹּאמֶר כִּדְבָרְךָ

character of the animals which cause the calamity. We find further therein an analogy to the haughtiness with which the Egyptians looked down upon the Israelites, as unclean creatures (see Philo Vit. Mos. i. 619).

3. *And the interpreters of secret signs did so with their hidden arts:* they could *create* and *increase* the evil, without having the power to effect its removal, which Pharaoh was compelled to demand of Moses. Besides, they produced only a small number of frogs in a little water; and thus, says Ebn Ezra, was Pharaoh convinced that Moses' power was greater than that of the magicians; and he therefore sent for Moses (see, however, on ver. 4). And as regards the remark of Bochart: "It is even uncertain, whether the magicians indeed produced real frogs; perhaps they brought them secretly from other places and gave them out as their own, or imposed upon Pharaoh in any other way by their tricks"; we refer to our note on vii. 12, where we have pointed out the probability, that the Chartumim must, indeed, be considered as standing also under the influence of God.

4. Tormented by the prodigious increase of the frogs, which his wise men had no power to stop, Pharaoh began to be seized by some vague feeling of the superiority of the God of Israel; and in his helplessness requested Moses to pray for him to that Deity of which he had but a short time since spoken in terms of contempt and insult (v. 2), and promised in his embarrassment to allow the departure of the Israelites for the purpose of worshipping that same Deity.—The ה paragogicum in ואשלחה expresses his readiness and willingness to permit their journey.

5. *And Moses said to Pharaoh, Glory over me! For when shall I entreat for thee?* (התפאר עלי למתי אעתיר לך): i. e., I will in this point follow thy command and acknowledge thee as my master, so that thou mayest save the appearance as if *thy will* had removed the plague. This seems to be the sense of these much disputed words, about which a considerable variety of interpretations has been proposed. Targum Onkelos renders: "Ask for thee something great, and fix thou thyself the time"; but it does not appear how that meaning lies in the words התפאר עלי. The same is the case with the translation of the Septuagint: *τάξαι πρός με πότε εὔξωμαι περὶ σοῦ*; and with those renderings, which agree with that interpretation; the Vulgate: (Constitue mihi quando deprecer pro te), the Syrian and Saadiah. Gesenius (Thes. ii. p. 1090), whom De Wette and Maurer follow, in order to support that translation, maintains, that פאר is identical with באר to explain. But באר has this signification only in Piel, never in Hithpael. Ebn Ezra explains: "I shall give thee glory by praying to the Lord to remove the plague on that day on which thou desirest it"—but thus the imperative התפאר would be inexplicable.—Rashi interprets a corresponding passage in Isaiah x. 15 perfectly correctly: "Shall the axe boast itself against him who heweth with it, saying, I am greater than thou"? (compare also

came up, and covered the land of Egypt. 3. And the [1]interpreters of secret signs did so with their [2]hidden arts, and brought up the frogs upon the land of Egypt. 4. Then Pharaoh called for Moses and Aaron, and said, Entreat the Lord, that He may take away the frogs from me, and from my people, and [3]I shall willingly let the people go, that they may sacrifice to the Lord. 5. And Moses said to Pharaoh, Glory over me! [4]For when shall I entreat for thee, and for thy servants, and for thy people, to destroy the frogs from thee and from thy houses, *that* they may remain in the river only? 6. And he said, [5]For to-morrow.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Magicians. [2] Enchantments. [3] I will let. [4] When. [5] To-morrow.

Judges vii. 2)—but he explains our passage quite differently and strangely, thus: "Procure glory for thyself, by shrewdly asking something which I might not be able to perform"—an interpretation which is partly followed by Philippson, who explains (like Mendelssohn, Zunz, Van Es, and others): "Gain glory over me; i.e., in order to show the whole extent of the divine power, in whose name I come, I will expose myself to the apparent risk, to pray for the removal of the frogs at any time appointed by thyself; I will thus yield to thee the advantage of incurring the possibility of a failure; try therefore to obtain the glory, thus to confound me; understood in this manner, the exclamation התפאר עלי has an infinitely ironical character, which describes most felicitously Moses' consciousness of his superiority and his contempt for Pharaoh"—an irony, however, utterly incompatible with the meek and humble character of the legislator, and ill-suiting the quiet and unimpassioned tenor of our narrative; whilst our explanation given above is in perfect harmony with the proverbial modesty of Moses. — Rashbam paraphrases, in his usual clear and common-sense manner: "Take advantage over me; say thy request, and I will do it," which nearly meets the sense. Luther combines this interpretation with that of the Septuag.: "Habe du die Ehre vor mir und bestimme mir." Gerlach aptly: "Glory over me; i.e., although it does not belong to thee to fix the time, yet since thou hast now acknowledged God, thou shalt again command me; and therefore appoint the day." Salomon translates: "Bediene dich deiner Herrlichkeit über mich," and explains: "It is an expression of respect and reverence, signifying, I am at thy command; I await thy orders, or a similar phrase." Frank (Nouvelle Méthode pour apprendre la lang. Hébr. Lexique, p. 24): "*Rely upon me* (s'appuyer)"; without sufficient grounds.— *That they may remain in the river only*, i.e., in their natural element, and in the usual quantity, but that they may retire from those places where their presence is obnoxious.

6. As the destruction of all the myriads of frogs was a work of gigantic power, Pharaoh did not require it instantaneously, as might be expected, but for the following day, requesting Moses to pray the same day, that the frogs might die to-morrow; for, says Rashbam, it is not likely that they should all die at once. We need, therefore, not adopt the artificial reason assigned for the procrastination of Pharaoh by Ebn Ezra, that according to the celestial constellations the destruction of the frogs would have ensued immediately, that very hour, but that Pharaoh wished to try the power

לְמַעַן תֵּדַע כִּי־אֵין כַּיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ׃ חמישי 7 וְסָרוּ הַצְפַרְדְּעִים מִמְּךָ
וּמִבָּתֶּיךָ וּמֵעֲבָדֶיךָ וּמֵעַמֶּךָ רַק בַּיְאֹר תִּשָּׁאַרְנָה׃ 8 וַיֵּצֵא מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן
מֵעִם פַּרְעֹה וַיִּצְעַק מֹשֶׁה אֶל־יְהוָה עַל־דְּבַר הַצְפַרְדְּעִים אֲשֶׁר־
שָׂם לְפַרְעֹה׃ 9 וַיַּעַשׂ יְהוָה כִּדְבַר מֹשֶׁה וַיָּמֻתוּ הַצְפַרְדְּעִים
מִן־הַבָּתִּים מִן־הַחֲצֵרֹת וּמִן־הַשָּׂדֹת׃ 10 וַיִּצְבְּרוּ אֹתָם חֳמָרִם
חֳמָרִם וַתִּבְאַשׁ הָאָרֶץ׃ 11 וַיַּרְא פַּרְעֹה כִּי הָיְתָה הָרְוָחָה
וְהַכְבֵּד אֶת־לִבּוֹ וְלֹא שָׁמַע אֲלֵהֶם כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה׃ ס 12 וַיֹּאמֶר
יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה אֱמֹר אֶל־אַהֲרֹן נְטֵה אֶת־מַטְּךָ וְהַךְ

of Moses, whether he was able to *prolong* the plague beyond its natural duration. Our text shows clearly the anguish of Pharaoh, who evidently did not know how long this troublesome vexation might protract itself. Perhaps Pharaoh hoped that the plague might disappear before the following morning, and that he thus might be spared the humiliation of acknowledging the power of God in this infliction.

8. The unhesitating certainty with which Moses had promised the destruction of the frogs—apparently without any special command of God (see ver. 9)—made, as Ebn Ezra observes, the prayer of Moses doubly necessary, and therefore the strong expression, *and Moses cried* is used.—על־דבר *because of, on account of;* and so the Targumim and Saadiah.—*Which he had brought* (שָׂם) *upon Pharaoh.* שום is used in the same signification in Deut. vii. 15; xxii. 14.—Others explain less appropriately: "because of the promise concerning the frogs, which he had made to Pharaoh." Thus Van Es, no doubt following the rendering of the Septuagint: περὶ τοῦ ὁρισμοῦ τῶν βατράχων ὡς ἐτάξατο Φαραώ—Moses cried to God "concerning the ceasing of the frogs as Pharaoh had fixed," and of the Vulgate, "pro sponsione ranarum quam condixerat Pharaoh," concerning the pledge he had given to Pharaoh with regard to the frogs. So also Glaire: "à cause de la parole qu'il avait donnée à Parhô au sujet des grenouilles."

9. Yards belonging to the private houses (חצרות from חצר to enclose), which signification appears here decidedly preferable to that of *villages,* which the Septuagint, Vulgate, Mendelssohn, and others, adopt, as they are included in the two other localities mentioned in our verse, the houses and fields.

10. חמרים חמרים in heaps and heaps, i. e., in numerous heaps; Onkelos, דגורין דגורין; Septuagint, θημωνίας θημωνίας; De Wette aptly: "haufenweise."—The repetition of the same word, with or without the copula, denotes, among other modifications of the sense, a great quantity. Compare note on iii. 15, לדר דר "in all generations"; and Gen. xiv. 10, בארות בארות, "*full of* bitumen-pits."

11. רְוָחָה or רֶוַח (Esther iv. 14), derived from רָוַח = רוּחַ, to take breath, signifies respiration, therefore relaxation or respite. Pharaoh, when again freed from the punishment, which had manifested to him in some degree the power of the Almighty, unscrupulously broke the promise he had given to Moses, and hardened again his heart against the exhortation of God's messenger, *as God had repeatedly predicted* (see iii. 19; iv. 21; vii. 4, 13).—The construction of the verbs of this sentence וירא and והכבד, the first only being a verb finite, the second

And he said, *Be it* according to thy word: that thou mayest know that *there is* none like the Lord our God.
7. And the frogs shall depart from thee and from thy houses, and from thy servants, and from thy people; they shall remain in the river only.
8. And Moses and Aaron went out from Pharaoh; and Moses cried to the Lord concerning the frogs which He had brought upon Pharaoh.
9. And the Lord did according to the word of Moses; and the frogs died out of the houses, out of the [1]courts, and out of the fields.
10. And they gathered them [2]in heaps: and the land smelled offensively.
11. But when Pharaoh saw that there was respite, he hardened his heart, and hearkened not to them, as the Lord had said.
12. And the Lord said to Moses, Say to Aaron,

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Villages. [2] Upon.

the simple infinitive, is not unusual in the enumeration of different successive actions of the same subject; thus Gen. xli. 43, וירכב אותו .... ונתון, "and he made him ride—and he gave." Eccl. ix. 11, שבתי וראו, "I returned and saw." Compare Jer. xiv. 5; Esth. ix. 6, 12; Eccl. viii. 9, etc.

CHAPTER VIII. 12—28.

SUMMARY.—*Third and fourth plague.* Aaron smote the dust with his staff, and all the dust of the land was converted into *gnats*, which the Egyptian magicians endeavoured in vain likewise to produce, and which they were therefore compelled to acknowledge as the work of a superior deity. But when Pharaoh persisted in his obstinacy, God brought a most noxious kind of *beetles* over the land, which, penetrating into the houses, attacked the persons, destroyed all kinds of property, and devastated the fields of the Egyptians; but which neither molested nor injured the Hebrews in Goshen or in any part of the country. Pharaoh called for Moses and Aaron, requesting them to pray to God for a removal of the insects, and allowing the Israelites to sacrifice in Egypt. But when Moses objected, that they could not, without imminent danger, kill before the eyes of the Egyptians animals, which they worshipped, Pharaoh promised to permit their journey to a little distance into the desert. The plague disappeared—and the faithlessness and obstinacy of Pharaoh returned.

THIRD PLAGUE. GNATS (כנם). VER. 12—15.

12. No warning was given to Pharaoh concerning this plague; but it was inflicted immediately after the removal of the frogs, to chastise him more strikingly for his treacherous vacillation. — Aaron was commanded *to smite the dust of the land* that it may become כִּנָּם or כִּנִּם (vers. 13, 14). It is a matter of difficulty precisely to determine the species or kind of animals denoted by that expression; but so much is certain: 1. That they must be a very small kind of insects, as they are represented to arise from the grains of dust; 2. That they are noxious both to man and beasts (ver. 13), and in a still higher degree than the frogs. The singular כן is used in Isaiah li. 6, where it represents something very frail, weak, and perishable (ישביה כמו כן ימתון). The etymology leads to the Greek root, κνάω, to *gnaw* or pinch—and this coincides with the English noun *gnats*, with which, indeed, all the qualities just mentioned perfectly agree. And the

אֶת־עֲפַר הָאָרֶץ וְהָיָה לְכִנִּם בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 13 וַיַּעֲשׂוּ־כֵן
וַיֵּט אַהֲרֹן אֶת־יָדוֹ בְמַטֵּהוּ וַיַּךְ אֶת־עֲפַר הָאָרֶץ וַתְּהִי הַכִּנָּם בָּאָדָם
וּבַבְּהֵמָה כָּל־עֲפַר הָאָרֶץ הָיָה כִנִּים בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 14 וַיַּעֲשׂוּ־
כֵן הַחַרְטֻמִּים בְּלָטֵיהֶם לְהוֹצִיא אֶת־הַכִּנִּים וְלֹא יָכֹלוּ וַתְּהִי הַכִּנָּם

Septuagint, which is naturally of great authority in all matters concerning the natural phenomena of Egypt, its home, translates also *σκνῖφες* (mosquito gnats); which Philo, likewise an Egyptian, describes thus (Vita Mos. ii. p. 97, Edit. Mang.): "It is an insect although of very small size, yet of a most troublesome nature; for it hurts not only the surface, causing intolerable and protracted itching, but penetrates also into the interior through the ears and noses. It flies even into the eyes of those who do not guard themselves, and produces serious pain," all which qualities are perfectly applicable to *gnats*, especially if we compare herewith the further descriptions of these animals as given by ancient and modern authors, from which the tormenting character of this plague will be obvious. Herodotus already observes (ii. 95): "Against the gnats, which are very numerous, the Egyptians use the following means: the inhabitants of Upper Egypt protect themselves by turrets, in which they sleep; for the gnats are unable to rise to any considerable elevation. Those who live near the marshes, take a net, with which they fish by day, spread it over their beds by night, and sleep beneath it; the gnats, which sting through clothes or linen, do not even try to penetrate through the net"; for it is a fact, that mosquitos and other flies will not pass through nets, although the meshes might be more than large enough to enable them to enter. Quite similar precautionary measures against the dangerous stings of the mosquitos are reported by the most recent travellers in Egypt.—Augustin further remarks: "The gnats in Egypt breed in the slime; they are very small flies, but most lively and versatile, not allowing man to rest; if they are scared off, they return with the greater eagerness." Besides, it is admitted on all hands, that these insects molest especially beasts, as oxen and horses, flying into their eyes and nostrils, driving them to madness and fury, and sometimes even torturing them to death. Theodoret (Histor. Eccl. Libr. ii. cap. 26) mentions, that when Sapores besieged Nisibis, his horses and elephants were so fearfully tormented by the stings of innumerable gnats, that they broke their yokes in wild fury, and ran madly about in all directions. They are, chiefly in seasons of a cool atmosphere, a perfect plague, rendering both eating and sleeping almost impossible. (Compare *Aristotle*, Hist. Anim. viii. 5; *Origen*, Homil. iii. in Exod.; *Theophrastus*, Hist. Plant. iv. 17; *Hasselquist*, Tr. p. 69; *Maillet*, Déscript. de l'Egypte ii. p. 134; *Sonnini*, Trav. i. p. 246; *Bochart*, Hieroz. iii. 458; and especially *Oedman*, Collect. i. p. 74, *et seq.*). These descriptions would well agree with the *culex raptans* of Linné, or the *culex molestus* of Forskal.—But it is evident from all this, that the traditional acceptation of כִּנָּם as *lice*, which is adopted by Josephus (Antiq. II., xiv. 3), Jonathan, Onkelos, Hesychius (*μικρα φθειρια*), Dioscorides, Taylor, Buxtorf, Le Clerc, and Luther, and defended—but with insufficient arguments—by Bochart and Bryant, is in no way appropriate, whilst the translations of Zunz and Arnheim, (Geschmeiss), and of Johlson and Salomon (Ungeziefer), are too indistinct; and the rendering of Philippson, *ants*, is a conjecture, neither supported by internal probability, nor by any ancient authority.

13. הַכִּנָּם. If the vowels are thus correctly given by the Masorites (although the Samaritan Version, which has כנים,

Stretch out thy [1]staff, and smite the dust of the land, that it may become [2]gnats throughout all the land of Egypt. 13. And they did so, for Aaron stretched out his hand with his [1]staff, and smote the dust upon the earth, and [3]the gnats were on man and on beast; all the dust of the land became gnats through all the land of Egypt. 14. And the interpreters of secret signs did so with their hidden arts, to bring forth gnats, but they could not: so there

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Rod. [2] Lice. [3] It became lice in man, and in beast.

would lead to כִּנָּם, the scriptio defectiva of the plural), the most rational explanation of this word is, to take the ם as a formative of the collective noun, so that ותהי הַכִּנָּם is used analogously to ותעל הצפרדע (ver. 2), compare Isa. xxxiii. 7, אֶרְאֶלָּם; see *Gesenius*, Lehrg. p. 517, No. 5. Eichhorn takes כנם as the root, and supposes it to be identical with σκνῖπες, which he considers as an *Egyptian* noun, the σ being omitted, and the π changed into ם, and pronouncing כְּנָם (see *Ewald*, Gr. Crit. p. 251). But in verse 14, we have the distinct form כִּנִּים, which is evidently a plural, and in Isa. li. 6, occurs the singular of this substantive, כֵּן, which would be inexplicable if the root were כנם. Maurer supposes הַכִּנָּם to be the singular כֵּן with the suffix ם ָ, "their gnats," that is, of Moses and Aaron, explaining the definite article as a demonstrative pronoun. But it is singularly forced, to call the gnats brought over Egypt by Moses and Aaron *their gnats*, and evidently היה כנים, in verse 13, is precisely the same as ותהי הכנם, in verse 14.—Now the *miracle* is expressed in the words: *all the dust of the land became gnats through all the land of Egypt*, showing the unparalleled quantity of these obnoxious insects, so that they became a perfect and *dangerous* plague. And this is the climax in the third wonder. Whilst the two first were only disagreeable or troublesome, the third was indeed dangerous for men and beasts, as those insects penetrated into the most delicate and tender parts of the body, the eyes and noses. We are further justified in supposing, that this plague also occurred at an unusual season, in the month of February, whilst travellers inform us, "that the gnats generally increase about the time of the drying of the rice, about the end of October, and that they are less numerous in other seasons of the year" (*Sonnini*, Travels, i. p. 246).

14. *And the interpreters of hidden signs did so* (ויעשו־כן) *with their secret arts*, namely, they smote the dust as Aaron had done, *in order to bring forth gnats*. This is the easy and natural interpretation of the verse. Others translate ויעשו־כן, *they tried to do so*, which application, although not without parallel, seems less unforced. Arnheim, quoting the explanation of Chiskuni, takes להוציא in the sense of *leading away*: the magicians tried to *remove* the gnats, but they failed, and thus there were gnats upon men and beasts. However, the magicians had first to prove their power *to produce* the same miracles as Moses and Aaron, and הוציא is here to be taken as in the phrase ותוצא הארץ דשא, "and the earth *produced* grass" (Gen. i. 12).—*But they could not*, according to Nachmanides, because here some *new* creation was to be effected (להוציא, see Gen. i. 24), whilst the blood was only a *change* of the same element, and the frogs were only called forth from the waters, where they *existed already before* (ויעלו, ver. 3). —*So there were gnats upon man and upon beasts*, an emphatical repetition, in order to point once more to the vexatious character of this plague; and we find in these words no allusion that "the gnats came upon

בָּאָדָם וּבַבְּהֵמָה׃ 15 וַיֹּאמְרוּ הַחַרְטֻמִּם אֶל־פַּרְעֹה אֶצְבַּע אֱלֹהִים הִוא
וַיֶּחֱזַק לֵב־פַּרְעֹה וְלֹא־שָׁמַע אֲלֵהֶם כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה׃ ס 16 וַיֹּאמֶר
יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה הַשְׁכֵּם בַּבֹּקֶר וְהִתְיַצֵּב לִפְנֵי פַרְעֹה הִנֵּה
יוֹצֵא הַמָּיְמָה וְאָמַרְתָּ אֵלָיו כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה שַׁלַּח עַמִּי וְיַעַבְדֻנִי׃
17 כִּי אִם־אֵינְךָ מְשַׁלֵּחַ אֶת־עַמִּי הִנְנִי מַשְׁלִיחַ בְּךָ וּבַעֲבָדֶיךָ
וּבְעַמְּךָ וּבְבָתֶּיךָ אֶת־הֶעָרֹב וּמָלְאוּ בָּתֵּי מִצְרַיִם אֶת־הֶעָרֹב וְגַם

the magicians also," as Ebn Ezra believes.

15. The wise men of Pharaoh were now, for the first time, and most reluctantly compelled to acknowledge: *this is the finger of God*, that is, not by the power of Moses and Aaron has this miracle been produced, but by that of a Deity, mightier than they or ourselves; thus, 1st. They did not admit that Moses and Aaron were more powerfully gifted than they were themselves: and 2nd. They asserted that not the God of the Israelites (יהוה), indignant at Pharaoh's refusal to allow the departure of His people, has inflicted this plague, but simply a superior deity (אלהים), or the influence of the stars.—*Finger* of God, is used instead of hand or power, as Psalm viii. 4; cix. 27, etc.

FOURTH PLAGUE. BEETLES (*Blatta Orientalis.* ערב). VER. 16—28.

16, 17. To fix precisely the animal constituting the fourth plague (עָרֹב), is a matter of almost still greater uncertainty than to determine the objects of the preceding calamity; but we have here, also, some criteria to guide us: 1st. These animals do not only attack man, but they fill the land (ver. 17); 2nd. They are of a *devouring* or rapacious propensity ("He sent the ערב, which devoured them," Ps. lxxviii. 45); 3rd. They cause *devastations* in the land (ver. 20); 4th. They must be different from, and more seriously injurious than gnats, which formed the third plague.—We shall now be able to judge of the different opinions advanced on the signification of ערב: — I. The old Hebrew and traditional meaning is, "*a mixture of noxious animals*," from the verb ערב, to mix. Thus it is understood already by Josephus (Antiq. II. xiv. 3): "he filled the country with various and manifold animals (*θηρίων παντοίων καὶ πολυτρόπων*), such as had never come into the sight of men before, by which the men perished themselves, and the land was deprived of the usual agricultural care." The word עָרֹב is, further, similarly interpreted by Targum Jonathan (a mixed swarm of wild beasts); the Vulgate (omne genus muscarum); Saadiah (a mixture of wild beasts); Rashi (all kinds of noxious animals and serpents and scorpions mixed together); Ebn Ezra (wild beasts in crowds, as lions, and wolves, and bears, and leopards); Luther (Ungeziefer); Mendelssohn (Gewild); Zunz (Die wilde Brut), and many others. But against this opinion several objections must be raised: *a.* That this would imply a violence of the plague which is nowhere expressed or indicated in the text, and which would, considering its fatal character, and observing the steady gradation of the wonders, place it immediately before the tenth plague (see *supra*, p. 119).—*b.* It is altogether indistinct, and conveys but a very vague idea of the plague.—*c.* ערב is evidently one individual animal, as appears from ver. 24; "there remained not one of the עָרֹב "which had covered the land;" for the expression "one of a mixture," would be strangely illogical. II. The Septuagint, and after it the greater part of the modern interpreters (Rosenmüller, in the Scholia,

were gnats upon man and upon beast. 15. And the interpreters of secret signs said to Pharaoh, This *is* the finger of God: but Pharaoh's heart remained hardened, and he hearkened not to them, as the Lord had said.

16. And the Lord said to Moses, Rise early in the morning and stand before Pharaoh—behold, he goeth out to the water—and say to him, Thus saith the Lord, Let my people go, that they may serve me. 17. [1]For if thou wilt not let my people go, behold, I shall send [2]the beetle upon thee, and upon thy servants, and upon thy people, and into thy houses; and the houses of the Egyptians shall be

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Else. [2] Swarms of flies.

but not in his Orient; De Wette, in his translation, although not in his Commentary on the Psalms; Gesenius, in the Dictionary, more decidedly than in the Thesaurus, and others), take ערב as *κυνόμυια*, *dog-fly*, an insect abounding in Egypt. But let us compare the most emphatical descriptions of these animals. Sonnini (iii. 226) writes: "The most numerous and troublesome insects in Egypt are *the flies* (musca domestica, *L.*). Man and beasts are most cruelly tormented by them. It is scarcely possible to imagine their rage if they are determined to settle on any part of the body. If they are scared away they come the next moment again, and their pertinacity exhausts even the greatest patience. They like, especially, to sit on the corners of the eyes, and on the eye-lids, those most sensitive parts, to which a little moisture attracts them." Let us even hear the evidently exaggerated account of Philo (Vit. Mos. ii. p. 101): "The flies rush on without fear, and if they are driven away they repeat their attacks with tenacious obstinacy till they have satisfied themselves with blood and flesh. Thus, the dog-fly is a bold and insidious insect; for it darts from a distance, like a spear, with a buzzing noise, and, approaching with great violence fixes its sting deeply into the skin." If we compare these descriptions with the essential criteria of the ערב above enumerated, it is obvious that it *cannot* mean dogflies, because *a.* these do not cover the *ground*; *b.* they do not devour or corrode things; *c.* they cause no devastations of the land; *d.* they are neither very different from, nor in any considerable degree more vexatious than the gnats (see our note to ver. 12). Thus the ערב does not correspond with that insect in any of its indisputable qualities, and we are necessarily compelled to deviate here from the authority of the Septuagint and Philo.—Passing over the arbitrary and unsupported suppositions of Werner, who explains ערב, *wolf* (see also Rashbam), or of others, who take it as *locusts*, we believe that all these criteria perfectly apply to the *Blatta Orientalis*, called in German Schabe or Kakerlake (Tarokan). This will at once be acknowledged as the most appropriate interpretation of עָרֹב, if we give here some extracts from descriptions of this insect. Pratte (Travels through Abyssinia, p. 143) narrates: "The Kakerlaks appear in a moment in the houses, and break forth, as if by a spell, suddenly from every aperture and fissure. Shortly before my departure from Adua, they filled, in a few minutes, the whole house of the resident missionary there. Only after the most laborious exertions, and after covering the floor of the apartments with hot coals, they succeeded in mastering them. If they make such attacks during the night, the inmates are com-

הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר־הֵם עָלֶיהָ׃ 18 וְהִפְלֵיתִי בַיּוֹם הַהוּא אֶת־אֶרֶץ
גֹּשֶׁן אֲשֶׁר עַמִּי עֹמֵד עָלֶיהָ לְבִלְתִּי הֱיוֹת־שָׁם עָרֹב לְמַעַן תֵּדַע
כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה בְּקֶרֶב הָאָרֶץ׃ ששי 19 וְשַׂמְתִּי פְדֻת בֵּין
עַמִּי וּבֵין עַמֶּךָ לְמָחָר יִהְיֶה הָאֹת הַזֶּה׃ 20 וַיַּעַשׂ יְהוָה כֵּן וַיָּבֹא
עָרֹב כָּבֵד בֵּיתָה פַרְעֹה וּבֵית עֲבָדָיו וּבְכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם תִּשָּׁחֵת

pelled to give up the houses; and even little children, or sick persons, who are unable to rise alone, are then exposed to the greatest danger of life." Hasselquist and Forskal further report, that they inflict very painful bites with their jaws; that they gnaw and destroy clothes, household-furniture, leather, and articles of every kind; and either consume or render unavailable all eatables. "Those who have travelled about the Nile," says Munk (Pal. p. 126, *b*), know what a molestation those insects are; the houses are infested by them, and they are often seen by millions." These descriptions fully agree with the etymology from the Arabic root عرب *to devour*, and with the narrative of our text. These insects really fill the land, and molest men and beasts; they consume all sorts of materials, devastate the country, and are in so far more detrimental than the gnats, as *they destroy also the property of the Egyptians;* they form, in this respect, the appropriate transition to the following severer plagues, which first ruin the wealth, and then the lives of the Egyptians. And thus the clear gradation of the plagues will be easily discernible. This beetle is an important emblem in the mythology of the Egyptians, and is found on almost all their sculptural and pictorial monuments. The Egyptian beetle is chiefly distinguished from the common one by a broad band upon the anterior margin of its oval corselet. Kirby (Bridgewater Treatises, ii. p. 357) mentions another etymological derivation: "It has been suggested to me, that the Egyptian plague of flies was a *cock-roach* (Blatta Aegyptiaca). The Hebrew name of the animal, which is the same by which the raven is distinguished, furnishes no slight argument in favour of it. The same word also signifies the *evening*. Now the cock-roach, at this time found in Egypt, is *black*, with the anterior margin of the thorax white, and they never emerge from their hiding-places till the *evening;* both of which circumstances would furnish a reason for the name given to it; and it might be called the *evening* insect, both from its colour, and the time of its appearance." This would, however, be a very indistinct designation, applying with equal, and perhaps greater propriety, to a considerable number of other animals, both insects, birds and wild beasts.—*Rise early in the morning*, etc. see note on vii. 15. About the accusative after מלא, see on i. 7.— *Whereon they are*, that is, the Egyptians, in contradistinction to the Israelites.

18, 19. The special providence of God, in favour of His people, will manifest itself in this plague still more openly and obviously than in the preceding three calamities, by exempting them entirely from the obnoxious insects, which will prove so troublesome to the persons, and so destructive to the property of their Egyptian neighbours. This fact will impress upon the latter the twofold truth: 1st. That the Israelites are the people of God (עמי), who sends the plagues over Egypt, on account, and in favour of, His people; 2nd. That He is the omnipotent Lord of the Universe; "that thou mayest know that *I am* the Lord in the midst of the earth;" or as Rashi explains, "although my glory is in heaven, my will is omnipotent on earth," similar to the expression in verse 6 (compare ix. 14,29),

full of the beetle, and also the ground whereon they are. 18. And I shall [1]distinguish in that day the land of Goshen, in which my people dwell, that no beetle shall be there, in order that thou mayest know that I *am* the Lord in the midst of the earth. 19. And I shall put a division between my people and thy people: to-morrow shall this sign be. 20. And the Lord did so; and there came swarms of beetles into the house of Pharaoh, and *into* his servants' houses, and into all the land of Egypt: the land was

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Sever.

and that, therefore, the idols of the Egyptians are as impotent as the arts of the magicians are fallacious and powerless. Bruce, however, who has thoroughly investigated this subject (Travels, i. p. 5; v. p. 191), explains the fact mentioned in these verses, in the following manner: "It is well known, that the land of Goshen was a land of pasture, which was not tilled or sown, because it was not overflowed by the Nile. But the land overflowed by the Nile was the black earth of the valley of Egypt. Now sandy plains, or pasture-ground, are, even now, always exempted from similar plagues, which are invariably limited to the black soil, and, even at present, the former kinds of territory are the usual refuge of all cattle from the destructive influence of those insects." But all this does not remove the miraculous character of the promise made to the Israelites with regard to this plague, as the latter were not limited to Goshen only, but lived scattered through all parts of Egypt; and here also they were to remain free from the calamity (ver. 19, see note on i. 7).—והפליתי from פלה, *to distinguish, to separate,* like ix. 4. The Septuagint, Vulgate, and Targum Jonathan (deriving it from פלא) translate: "I shall make wonderful the land of Goshen" (*καὶ παραδοξάσω* . . . . *τὴν γῆν Γεσέμ*; faciamque mirabilem . . . . terram Gessen; ואעבד פלאין ביומא ההוא עם ארעא דגשן). Probably both significations of dividing and miraculously distinguishing, are combined in the word והפליתי, which conveys at once both notions to the mind of the reader conversant with the Hebrew idiom.—*In the midst of the earth* (בקרב הארץ), in which phrase the word בקרב is not to be taken so literally *in the centre* as Ebn Ezra does.—פְּדֻת (from פדה in its primitive signification, to dissect, to separate) separation, division, and thus the Septuagint (*διαστολήν*); Vulgate (divisionem); Ebn Ezra (הפרש); Rashi (שיבדל); Rashbam (הבדלה), and others. Targum Onkelos takes פְּדֻת in its more usual sense of redemption, and is, therefore, compelled to make an arbitrary addition to the text, rendering: "I shall secure deliverance to *my* people, but over *thy* people I shall bring the plague."—*To-morrow shall this sign be.* In this, as in all similar cases, God fixed the time of the plague before its occurrence, not only to afford Pharaoh an opportunity of repenting, but to preclude at once the insinuation that it happened by chance, or in natural course, and to convince the obdurate mind of Pharaoh still more forcibly of God's unlimited power; compare ix. 5.

20. The predicted calamity took place at the appointed time; and enormous swarms of beetles (ערב כבד) molested the palace of Pharaoh and the dwellings of all his people, and devastated the land of Egypt. Referring to our exposition on ver. 16, we find the *wonder* of this plague in the following data: 1. That, as it occurred at the command of God, so it disappeared at the prayer of Moses (ver. 28). 2. That those insects infested the

הָאָרֶץ מִפְּנֵי הֶעָרֹב׃ 21 וַיִּקְרָא פַרְעֹה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וּֽלְאַהֲרֹן וַיֹּאמֶר
לְכוּ זִבְחוּ לֵאלֹהֵיכֶם בָּאָרֶץ׃ 22 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה לֹא נָכוֹן לַעֲשׂוֹת
כֵּן כִּי תּוֹעֲבַת מִצְרַיִם נִזְבַּח לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ הֵן נִזְבַּח אֶת־תּוֹעֲבַת
מִצְרַיִם לְעֵינֵיהֶם וְלֹא יִסְקְלֻנוּ׃ 23 דֶּרֶךְ שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים נֵלֵךְ

land in prodigious numbers, and with a violence unheard of before or after that time; and 3. That the Israelites, whether living in Goshen or dispersed throughout Egypt, were perfectly free from the calamity. Gesenius, who takes ערב as dog-fly, is obliged to suppose the wonder to have consisted in the circumstance, that those insects, which usually molest beasts only, changed their nature and attacked men also (ver. 17); and Rosenmüller, who is well aware that the dog-flies do not devastate *the land*, explains that by the words *the land*, the *inhabitants* of the land are to be understood. The forced character of either opinion is too obvious to require comment.

21. This plague was so fearful, and so decidedly more alarming than the preceding miracles, that the magicians did not even try their arts to produce similar effects, and Pharaoh was once more compelled to send for Moses and Aaron, and to offer them concessions: *Go you, sacrifice to your God in the land*, that is, in Egypt; naturally fearful, lest the Israelites if once beyond his boundaries, would not return to resume their slavish works, so cruelly and unjustly imposed upon them.

22. Moses objects, they could not venture to sacrifice in Egypt, for the people would stone them, *if they sacrificed the abominations of the Egyptians* (תועבת מצרים) *before their eyes*; that is, if they killed and offered those animals which it was, in the eyes of the Egyptians, an abominable crime to kill, because they were objects of holy veneration. The bull, the cow, the sheep, and the goat, the usual sacrifices of the Hebrews, were among the sacred animals of the Egyptians; although we know that none of these animals—perhaps with the only exception of the cow, which was sacred to Isis (Herod. ii. 4)—was universally worshipped by the Egyptians; but that the same animals which were considered inviolable in some districts, were killed and eaten in others. So, for instance, the Thebans abstained from eating mutton, but killed goats; whilst the Mendesians held the goats sacred, but killed sheep. The probable cause of these surprising discrepancies is, that each district, or nomos, formed originally an independent state, mostly founded by priests, the centre of which was the temple, and that even after the amalgamation of those different provinces and tribes under one common rule, they retained the religious customs of their ancestors, which were still clearly discernible in later times. It is not the place here, psychologically to investigate into the origin, extent, and internal character of so extraordinary a phenomenon as the animal worship, which was not limited to Egypt alone, but was, and partially is still, prevalent throughout the whole of Africa; to enquire whether the leading principle in declaring an animal sacred, was its usefulness or its dangerousness, its majestic appearance or its beauty, or the contrary;—it is sufficient to be conscious of the truth, that the monstrosity of animal worship is so distant from civilised or refined notions, that we experience the greatest difficulty in attempting to represent or to analyze to ourselves its character and tendency. (Compare our supplementary note on ii. 10). But already Herodotus (ii. 65) reports about the severity and fanaticism with which the killing of those beasts was prosecuted: "If a person kills one of them designedly, the punishment is death; if it is done unintentionally, he pays the fine which the priests impose upon him. But he who kills an ibis or a hawk, be it

devastated by the beetle. 21. And Pharaoh called for Moses and for Aaron, and said, Go you, sacrifice to your God in the land. 22. And Moses said, It is not meet to do so; for we shall sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians to the Lord our God: behold, shall we sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians before their eyes, and will they not stone us? 23. We will go a three days' journey

designedly or not, must mercilessly die." This was, for instance, the fate of a Roman ambassador, who had unintentionally killed a cat. At conflagrations the first and most anxious care of the Egyptians was to save the cats and dogs from the flames. The Egyptian armies brought not seldom home, from their foreign expeditions, a great number of these animals, which they had found dead, and which they buried in their own country, at appointed places, with great pomp and under general lamentation, after having carefully embalmed them. If a cat died in a house, the inmates, as a sign of mourning, shaved the eyebrows; but, if a dog died, the whole body was shaved.—Onkelos, although evading the difficulty by omitting תועבת מצרים paraphrases correctly: because we take those animals, which the Egytians worship, as a sacrifice to the Lord our God. Others (as Rashi, etc.), believe, that תועבת מצרים is simply identical with אלהי מצרים, as Camosh, the god of the Moabites, is called שקץ מואב (1 Kings xi. 7) *the abomination of the Moabites*. But how can we suppose that Moses would, in addressing Pharaoh, call the Egyptian gods *abominations*; and this objection is but artificially removed by the opinion of some interpreters, that Moses really said to Pharaoh אלהי מצרים but that he *wrote down* later תועבת מצרים: which precedent would lead to questionable analogies. Not more tenable appears to us the opinion of Hengstenberg, Gerlach, and others, that the Israelites feared to sacrifice animals, which were not worthy or pure enough in the eyes of the Egyptians, to be offered to the Deity, and which would thus be an abomination for them. It is true that the Egyptians were most particularly careful in selecting the most faultless animals for their sacrifices; that they had a great number of minute precepts to regulate this matter, and that capital punishment awaited any one who sacrificed an animal which had not been examined by the priests, and, by the impress of their official seal, declared fit for an offering to the gods. But was it to the deities *of the Egyptians* that the Israelites intended to sacrifice? Could it, then, revolt the religious feelings of the former, if they saw animals which, to their notions, were not perfectly clean, sacrificed to a deity which they did not acknowledge?—How Moses could expect that the shepherd-king, who was of *Arabian* descent, would admit the force of an argument based on truly *Egyptian* idolatry, has been explained in our note to i. 8, p. 7. Besides, Moses had certainly to fear the Egyptians, who, although subjugated, formed still the majority of the population.—In the phrase הן נזבח ... ולא יסקלני, the interjection הן has the *force* of the conjunction אם, for which it is sometimes even used; for instance, Lev. xxv. 20; 2 Chron. vii. 13. But this signification of הן is easily explicable from the character of the Hebrew syntax, the structure of which is so simple, that usually the period is formed of independent sentences, loosely connected by the easiest particles; and the *Syntaxis* is, in fact, more properly speaking, a *Parataxis*; so in our instance: "Behold! we shall sacrifice . . , and will they not stone us?" Instead of uniting both parts into one sentence, it is left to the reader to find himself their connection and logical relation.

23. Moses demanded, therefore, per-

בַּמִּדְבָּר וְזָבַחְנוּ לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ כַּאֲשֶׁר יֹאמַר אֵלֵינוּ׃ 24 וַיֹּאמֶר
פַּרְעֹה אָנֹכִי אֲשַׁלַּח אֶתְכֶם וּזְבַחְתֶּם לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם בַּמִּדְבָּר
רַק הַרְחֵק לֹא־תַרְחִיקוּ לָלֶכֶת הַעְתִּירוּ בַּעֲדִי׃ 25 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה
הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי יוֹצֵא מֵעִמָּךְ וְהַעְתַּרְתִּי אֶל־יְהוָה וְסָר הֶעָרֹב מִפַּרְעֹה
מֵעֲבָדָיו וּמֵעַמּוֹ מָחָר רַק אַל־יֹסֵף פַּרְעֹה הָתֵל לְבִלְתִּי שַׁלַּח אֶת־
הָעָם לִזְבֹּחַ לַיהוָה׃ 26 וַיֵּצֵא מֹשֶׁה מֵעִם פַּרְעֹה וַיֶּעְתַּר אֶל־יְהוָה׃
27 וַיַּעַשׂ יְהוָה כִּדְבַר מֹשֶׁה וַיָּסַר הֶעָרֹב מִפַּרְעֹה מֵעֲבָדָיו וּמֵעַמּוֹ לֹא
נִשְׁאַר אֶחָד׃ 28 וַיַּכְבֵּד פַּרְעֹה אֶת־לִבּוֹ גַּם בַּפַּעַם הַזֹּאת וְלֹא
שִׁלַּח אֶת־הָעָם׃ פ

mission for the Israelites to go a three days' journey into the desert (out of the sight of the Egyptians), and to perform there the sacrifices to the Lord—"*as He will say to us,*" namely, which animals we shall sacrifice, and in what quantity. The Sept., Vulg. and Luther take, not inappropriately, יאמר as a past tense: *as He has commanded us*, (see iii. 18).

24—28. Pharaoh, forced by the insupportable vexation of the beetles, consents to the request, only adding, *that they should not go too far away*, i. e. not more than a three days' journey. Moses did not object to this condition; he committed himself entirely to the guidance and direction of God; he was contented if he but attained his immediate purpose of moving Pharaoh to allow the departure of the Israelites; and he confided faithfully in God, who, he was assured, would by His judgments and the succeeding events, remove the obligations which that promise imposed upon him and the Israelites.—Moses, once deluded by Pharaoh after the second plague (vers. 4, 11), fears the same faithlessness on this occasion, well knowing that the submission of Pharaoh was not the consequence of true contrition, nor of his acknowledgment of the God of the Hebrews, but only the momentary effect of an urgent embarrassment. He, therefore, warned Pharaoh not to deceive him again; prayed then to the Lord, caused the disappearance of the plague, but was as unscrupulously deceived by the hardened tyrant as before.—הָתֵל (used also in Job xiii. 9) is obviously the Infinitive Hiphil of תלל. Although this root does not occur in Kal, we meet, besides הָתֵל, with several other forms derived from it, as הֵתֵל (Gen.

ט 1 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה בֹּא אֶל־פַּרְעֹה וְדִבַּרְתָּ אֵלָיו כֹּה־אָמַר

CHAPTER IX.

SUMMARY.—Pestilence among the cattle (ver. 1—7); boils on the skin (ver. 8—12); and a hail-storm of unparalleled vehemence, destroying the crops and herds of the field, and killing men and beasts, constitute the three following plagues, which although they manifested their purport and the might of the Lord still more obviously by not injuring the Israelites, and although they produced by the combined terrors of the elements (vers. 14, 23, 24) a momentary self-humiliation of Pharaoh (ver. 27), did yet not effect an internal and thorough change of the obstinate mind of the Egyptian king; and the Israelites were hopelessly retained in their oppressive bondage (see besides notes on vers. 1, 8 and 13).

into the desert, and sacrifice to the Lord our God, as He will say to us. 24. And Pharaoh said, I will let you go, that you may sacrifice to the Lord your God in the desert; only you shall not go very far away: entreat for me. 25. And Moses said, Behold, I go out from thee, and I shall entreat the Lord, [1]and the beetle will disappear from Pharaoh, from his servants, and from his people, to-morrow: but let not Pharaoh deal deceitfully any more in not letting the people go to sacrifice to the Lord. 26. And Moses went out from Pharaoh, and entreated the Lord. 27. And the Lord did according to the word of Moses; and [2]the beetle disappeared from Pharaoh, from his servants, and from his people: there remained not one. 28. And Pharaoh hardened his heart this time also, and he would not let the people go.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—That the swarms of flies may depart.
[2] He removed the swarms of flies.

xxxi. 7); הֵתַלְתָּ (Judges xvi. 10); הוּתַל (Isa. xliv. 20); and תְּהָתֵלּוּ instead of תְּהָתֵלּוּ (Job. xiii. 9). In other forms the ה has been retained as a radical letter, so that יְהָתֵל (1 Kings xviii. 17); יְהָתֵלּוּ (Jer. ix. 4), etc., must be referred to התל as the root. As the Hiphil הֵתֵל seems to have been the form used the most frequently, it is not surprising that the formative ה has gradually assumed the character of a radical. Perhaps we may explain the latter forms as mere modifications of the former; for יְהָתֵל is equivalent to יְהַתֵּל, the long vowel under הָ being compensated by the dagesh forte in תּ (as, for instance, תָּסֹב = תִּסֹּב and יִדְּמוּ = יִדְמוּ 1 Sam. ii. 9); and the ל in יְהָתֵלוּ has lost the dagesh, this word standing *in pausa*.—וַיָּסַר (ver. 27) (future *Kal* of סוּר instead of וַיָּסָר, ר being a guttural, and, therefore, preferring the Pathach; compare Ruth iv. 1)—the beetle *disappeared*. Although that form might also be the *Hiphil* instead of וַיָּסֶר "and He (God) *removed* the beetle," as the English version and others translate; the analogy of ver. 25 (וסר הערב) renders it preferable to take it as the *Kal*, in an intransitive signification.

CHAP. IX. 1. Then the Lord said to Moses, Go to Pharaoh, and tell him, Thus saith the Lord God of the

FIFTH PLAGUE. PESTILENCE AMONG THE CATTLE (דבר). VER. 1—7.

1. After the beetles, which had devastated considerable property, God inflicted, as the fifth plague, an extensive destruction of the most necessary and valuable animals of the Egyptians: and this calamity caused, therefore, infinitely more real damage than all the preceding plagues, to a country, the wealth of which consists, in a great measure, in its cattle. Although neither ancient nor modern travellers and geographers have paid particular attention to the diseases of the cattle in Egypt, it is self-evident, that in a climate, where inundations,

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הָעִבְרִים שַׁלַּח אֶת־עַמִּי וְיַעַבְדֻנִי׃ 2 כִּי אִם־מָאֵן
אַתָּה לְשַׁלֵּחַ וְעוֹדְךָ מַחֲזִיק בָּם׃ 3 הִנֵּה יַד־יְהוָה הוֹיָה בְּמִקְנְךָ
אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׂדֶה בַּסּוּסִים בַּחֲמֹרִים בַּגְּמַלִּים בַּבָּקָר וּבַצֹּאן דֶּבֶר כָּבֵד
מְאֹד׃ 4 וְהִפְלָה יְהוָה בֵּין מִקְנֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבֵין מִקְנֵה מִצְרָיִם
וְלֹא יָמוּת מִכָּל־לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל דָּבָר׃ 5 וַיָּשֶׂם יְהוָה מוֹעֵד לֵאמֹר

morasses, burning winds, and other injurious influences tending to infest the air, are particularly prevalent, pestilence and similar diseases must be frequent and endemic. It is confirmed by all modern travellers, that in the Delta of the Nile pestilence rages from time to time among the cattle with such violence, that the inhabitants are compelled to import oxen from Syria or the islands of the Archipelago. We must, therefore, find the *miracle* in circumstances similar to those of the preceding plague, namely: 1. In the aggravated character of the pestilence (ver. 3); 2. that it took place on the command of God, evidently at an unusual season; and 3. that the Israelites were again exempted from it (ver. 6).

2. *And wilt hold them still;* Septuag., ἀλλὰ ἔτι ἐγκρατεῖς αὐτούς; Onkelos, מתקיף בהון. See Job ii. 9.

3. The construction of the Hebrew words יד יי׳ וכו׳ is: the hand of the Lord is upon thy cattle....*as* a very heavy pestilence.—In the enumeration of the domestic animals of Egypt, *the horse* occupies the first place, that country being particularly rich in horses of superior quality, which were sought by foreign princes and monarchs. They were chiefly used for the war chariots, which formed one of the most famous arms of the Egyptians. See Deut. xvii. 16; Gen. xlviii. 17; and our note on xiv. 7.—*Mules and asses* also are frequently found on Egyptian monuments. Asses were commonly used for riding (see our note on iv. 20), and they are represented richly caparisoned. They were further employed for treading out corn, and for many, especially agricultural purposes, for which their hardiness and the small cost of their maintenance rendered them particularly appropriate. How great the number of asses were, is obvious from the fact, that a single individual possessed not less than seven hundred and sixty of them as beasts of burden, and there is at present scarcely any husbandman who does not possess some asses. Perfectly unfounded is, therefore, the assertion of Bohlen, that the Egyptians kept no asses, which they abhorred on account of their colour. The usual sacrifices of Typhon consisted in asses, and they must, therefore, have existed in Egypt. And admitted even, that asses were considered unclean animals, they were, from this reason, as little excluded from the land as swine, which were regarded with particular abomination, and were yet repeatedly represented on the monuments.—Although the testimony of Minutoli, who is said to have found heads and necks of *camels* represented, two by two, upon the obelisks of Luxor, is still an isolated monumental evidence for the existence of camels in ancient Egypt; we are by no means justified in impugning the truth of the Scripture account, which mentions these useful animals not only in our passage, but already in the time of Abraham, who received some of them from the Egyptian king as a present. It is, a priori, improbable that the Egyptians should not, at a very early period, have been acquainted, through the medium of the Arabic tribes and the eastern merchants, with the valuable qualities of that patient animal. At present, it is one of the principal and of the most lucrative occupations of the Arabic tribes inhabit-

Hebrews, Let my people go that they may serve me.
2. For if thou refuse to let *them* go, and wilt hold them
still, 3. Behold, the hand of the Lord is upon thy cattle
which *is* in the field, upon the horses, upon the asses, upon
the camels, upon the oxen, and upon the sheep: [1]a very
heavy pestilence. 4. And the Lord will [2]distinguish
between the cattle of Israel and the cattle of Egypt: and
there will nothing die of all *that belongs* to the children of
Israel. 5. And the Lord fixed an appointed time,
saying, To-morrow the Lord will do this thing in the land.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—There shall be a very grievous murrain. [2] Sever.

ing the borders of the valley of Egypt, to rear camels and to sell them into the different provinces. They are extensively employed for the transport of goods, and especially for the ingathering of the crops, for which even those, who do not possess any, hire them according to their wants. Although they were not used in war as by the Indians and other ancient nations, they were found very valuable for the transport of baggage and provisions. Under these circumstances it is of little importance, that camels do not, except in very rare instances, occur on Egyptian sculptures or paintings. Not every thing, which is not represented on the monuments, was therefore necessarily unknown to the Egyptians. The monuments are neither intended to furnish, nor can they furnish, a complete delineation of all the branches of public and private life, of all the products and phenomena, of the whole animal, vegetable and mineral creation of the country. They cannot be viewed as a complete cyclopædia of Egyptian customs and civilisation. Thus we find no representation of fowls and pigeons, although the country abounded in them; of the wild ass and wild boar, although frequently met with in Egypt; none of the process relating to the casting of statues and other objects in bronze, although many similar subjects connected with the arts are represented; none of the marriage-ceremony, and of numerous other subjects. Since, therefore, no conclusion can be drawn from the absence of monumental delineation to the actual existence of an animal in Egypt, it is unnecessary to recur, in this instance, to the supposition, that the Egyptians abstained from representing the camels on their holy monuments, because it was too much associated with the idea of the nomad shepherds, so detested by the priests. This explanation, scarcely tenable in itself, would not apply to any of the other instances enumerated.—*Sheep* are so far from not thriving in Egypt, as modern critics have asserted with a polemical view to the Biblical statements, that they are expressly reported by ancient and modern travellers to be found there in great abundance and of superior quality. In Thebes they were sacred; and in the Mendesian district they were sacrificed (Herod ii. 41, 42); in Lykopolis they were eaten; they lambed and were shorn twice annually (Diod. i. 36, 87); on the monuments they occur most frequently, and in some districts very great numbers were kept. They are as abundant at present in Egypt; their wool is an important article of export; and their flesh forms the usual animal food of the inhabitants (see *Wilkinson*, ii. p. 368; *Champollion*, Letters, p. 51; Déscript. de l'Egypte xvii. p. 129).

4. והפלה, see note on viii. 18.—מכל אשר לבני ישראל=מכל־לבני ישראל.

5. *And God fixed an appointed time* for the occurrence of the plague (see on viii. 19).—Nachmanides explains more speciously than correctly; the cattle, which

מָחָר יַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה בָּאָרֶץ׃ 6 וַיַּעַשׂ יְהוָה אֶת־הַדָּבָר
הַזֶּה מִמָּחֳרָת וַיָּמָת כֹּל מִקְנֵה מִצְרָיִם וּמִמִּקְנֵה בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא־מֵת
אֶחָד׃ 7 וַיִּשְׁלַח פַּרְעֹה וְהִנֵּה לֹא־מֵת מִמִּקְנֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל עַד־אֶחָד
וַיִּכְבַּד לֵב פַּרְעֹה וְלֹא שִׁלַּח אֶת־הָעָם׃ פ
8 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וְאֶל־אַהֲרֹן קְחוּ לָכֶם מְלֹא חָפְנֵיכֶם פִּיחַ

is *in the fields* (בארץ) will die, because the shepherds so despised among the Egyptians lived far from the towns.

6. *And all the cattle of Egypt* (i. e., of the Egyptians) died. It is not unusual, that the adjective *all* signifies in Hebrew only *a great part*; for instance, in Deut. xix. 3, it is said, that "*all* murderers" should fly to the refuge cities, which the next verse qualifies by stating the class of murderers entitled to that privilege. And so we must understand that word here, since we learn from vers. 10 and 19, that not *all* the cattle of the Egyptians was destroyed. A similar interpretation we are compelled to adopt in ver. 25, where we cannot explain literally that "*all* the grass of the field" was destroyed by hail, on account of x. 15, where the locusts are described causing the devastation of the grass, "which the hail had left."—Rashi, following the Midrash, interprets: "all cattle, which was *in the field*, died (ver. 3), but that which the Egyptians either kept permanently in their houses, or had driven home at the commencement of the plague was not destroyed."—Bullet: "Des bêtes de toutes les sortes"; against the genius of the Hebrew language.

7. לא .... עד אחד, ne unus quidem. עד, both as particle and as conjunction, as in Arabic حتّى, *includes* the object before which it stands; for instance, Job xxv. 5, "Behold even the moon does not shine before God"; that is, everything disappears before the purity of God, even the moon (עד ירח). Compare, Haggai ii. 19.

Sixth Plague. Boils (שחין). Ver. 8—12.

8. Now even the persons of the Egyptians were attacked with leprous diseases, which although not fatal, are attended with the most excruciating pains, and might, if neglected, prove dangerous: this is the next step in the climax of the divine plagues dispensed against Egypt. The disease is called שחין פרח אבעבעת. The root שחן signifies in the Semitic dialects *to be warm*, (to suffer from hot fever; Rashi, שחין לשון חמימה); therefore is שחין *an inflammation of the skin*, which naturally produces, or *breaks out into* (פרח) *pustules* or blains, (אבעבעת from בוע, kindred with בעע and נבע, to spring forth, with א prostheticum, Arabic بعى intumuit sanieque sorduit ulcer; Septuagint, φλυκτίδες; Vulgate, vesicae). The general character of this plague is, therefore, perfectly clear, although it is difficult to fix the exact disease here expressed. That it is an epidemic commonly prevalent in Egypt, is obvious from Deut. xxviii. 27, 35, where it is simply called שחין מצרים, the שְׁחִין of Egypt; and we learn from the same passage, that it belongs to those disorders which defy human skill (אשר לא תוכל להרפא); but the successive change of the inhabitants of Egypt and their customs, has produced so essential modifications in the sanitary condition of the country, that it is hazardous, at present, to decide on the exact nature of that epidemic. Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Reinhard, and others, suppose it to be the *elephantiasis*, which covers the skin with black scurfs, and tumefies the feet, producing tormenting pain. Thus says Lucretius, vi. 1112, 1113.

6. And the Lord did that thing on the morrow, and all the cattle of Egypt died; but of the cattle of the children of Israel died not one. 7. And Pharaoh sent, and, behold, there was not one of the cattle of the Israelites dead. [1]But the heart of Pharaoh was hardened, and he did not let the people go.—8. And the Lord said to Moses and to Aaron, Take to you handfuls of soot of the furnace, and let Moses sprinkle it towards heaven before the eyes of

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—And.

"Est elephas morbus, qui propter flumina Nili,
Gignitur Ægypto in media, nec præterea usquam";

and Pliny (Nat. Hist. xxvi. 1, 5), calls it "an evil peculiar to Egypt" (Ægypti peculiare malum). It is named lopra nodosa or tuberculosa (*Cels.* Med. iii. 25), with which the expression אבעבעת well harmonizes. The elephantiasis begins generally with scrofulous tumours on the skin, and is characterized by glands in the face and other parts of the body; they are at first of the size of a pea, then of a walnut, or of a hen's egg. But it is known, that it is a peculiarity of this hideous disease, that the patient feels in all other respects quite healthy, and may live with that complaint for many years. And these symptoms seem to be contrary to the description of our text; because 1. The magicians could not stand before Moses because of the boils (ver. 11); and 2. the שחין caused certainly pain, but it was in itself no more grievous plague than the gnats or the beetles; but only a gradation in *the same kind*. Besides 3. the Elephantiasis never infects animals (vers. 9, 10).—Now, Eichhorn and others take שחין as the disease, which is thus described: "In the autumn men are attacked by ulcers at the thighs and knees, by which they are destroyed in two or three days." But our text does not speak of a deadly disease; for in no part is it mentioned, that it was attended with the destruction of life.—Other writers again (*Thevenot*, Voyage du Levant, ii. 831; *Rosenmüller*, Antiq. iii. 222; *Sonnini*, Trav. ii. 334) understand שחין as a kind of painful blisters, which at the time of the rise of the Nile are frequent in Egypt, which are increased by drinking water of the Nile, and which are therefore called "grains of the Nile" (Habe Nili, *Volney*, i. 192). But 1. this cannot be called an "incurable disease" (Deut. xxviii, 35), for it generally passes away from itself, or after the application of simple domestic remedies; and 2. it never befalls the cattle.—And Jahn, lastly, (Archaeol. I., ii. 384) supposes שחין to be the *Barras* or black leprosy (λειχὴν ἄγριος, or Μελανδρία in animals), which, however, according to the description given by him invariably ends in death. We must, therefore, at the present state of the pathological observations of Egypt, content ourselves to know the general character of the disease expressed by שחין.—מלא חפניכם, literally, the fulness of your two hands (from חפן, to take with both hands, dual חָפְנַיִם).—פיח (from נפח=פוח, to blow) the ashes or cinders, which are *blown* about in the air. Septuagint, *αἰθάλη*, *soot*; Vulgate, cinis; Rashi: "It signifies *blowing*, because the wind drives it away and dispels it."—כבשן is, as Kimchi observes, *a furnace* for melting metal, or a *lime-kiln*, different from תנור, *oven*.—Osburn (Mon. Hist. ii. p. 585) rejects, without argument, this signification "as a mistake altogether," and translates, also without proof, "country on fire," connecting this expression with the burning of the stubble and weeds on the high lands. But this is done in Egypt during the overflow of the Nile, whereas

כִּבְשָׁ֔ן וּזְרָק֥וֹ מֹשֶׁ֛ה הַשָּׁמַ֖יְמָה לְעֵינֵ֥י פַרְעֹֽה׃ 9 וְהָיָ֣ה לְאָבָ֔ק עַ֖ל
כָּל־אֶ֣רֶץ מִצְרָ֑יִם וְהָיָ֨ה עַל־הָאָדָ֜ם וְעַל־הַבְּהֵמָ֗ה לִשְׁחִ֛ין פֹּרֵ֥חַ
אֲבַעְבֻּעֹ֖ת בְּכָל־אֶ֥רֶץ מִצְרָֽיִם׃ 10 וַיִּקְח֞וּ אֶת־פִּ֣יחַ הַכִּבְשָׁ֗ן וַיַּֽעַמְדוּ֙
לִפְנֵ֣י פַרְעֹ֔ה וַיִּזְרֹ֥ק אֹת֛וֹ מֹשֶׁ֖ה הַשָּׁמָ֑יְמָה וַיְהִ֗י שְׁחִין֙ אֲבַעְבֻּעֹ֔ת
פֹּרֵ֖חַ בָּאָדָ֥ם וּבַבְּהֵמָֽה׃ 11 וְלֹא־יָֽכְל֣וּ הַֽחַרְטֻמִּ֔ים לַעֲמֹ֥ד לִפְנֵ֛י מֹשֶׁ֖ה
מִפְּנֵ֣י הַשְּׁחִ֑ין כִּֽי־הָיָ֣ה הַשְּׁחִ֔ין בַּֽחַרְטֻמִּ֖ם וּבְכָל־מִצְרָֽיִם׃ 12 וַיְחַזֵּ֤ק
יְהוָה֙ אֶת־לֵ֣ב פַּרְעֹ֔ה וְלֹ֥א שָׁמַ֖ע אֲלֵהֶ֑ם כַּאֲשֶׁ֛ר דִּבֶּ֥ר יְהוָ֖ה
אֶל־מֹשֶֽׁה׃ ס 13 וַיֹּ֤אמֶר יְהוָה֙

this plague occurred in the course of March.

9. *And it shall be like dust in all the land of Egypt*, that is, it shall be spread by the wind throughout Egypt like dust, carrying disease along with it wherever it settles. Others explain: *it shall become dust* in the land of Egypt. If so, asks Rosenmüller, justly, why did not Moses take dust at once, and spread it towards heaven? About שחין פרח אבעבעת see on ver. 8.

10. And Moses "sprinkled soot of the furnace towards heaven," as a symbolical action, indicating that God sends the diseases through the infected air upon the Egyptians. It is well known that the ancient nations were accustomed to such mysterious signs, with which, therefore, most of the plagues are introduced (see vii. 20; viii. 2, 13, etc.). Some archæologists find a peculiar significance in the ceremony here performed by Moses, bringing it into connection with a strange and barbarous custom long in vogue among the Egyptians. They had several towns consecrated to Typhon, the evil genius in Egyptian mythology; some of these Typhonic cities were Heliopolis, Idithyia, Abarei, and Busiris, where annually, at certain seasons of the year, human sacrifices were offered to the ominous tutelary deity. It is reported, that for victims of these sanguinary rites, persons were chosen with light, reddish hair, and a certain complexion rarely met with among the native Egyptians. Strangers were, therefore, usually taken; they were burnt alive on conspicuous altars, and thus sacrificed to avert the wrath of the god, and to save the country from destruction; the ashes were then gathered by the priests and scattered in the air, with the confident hope that with that sacred dust the blessings of heaven would spread over the whole country. Now, it is supposed, that during the time of the oppression of the Israelites in Egypt, these unfortunate victims were taken from them, as an offering particularly grateful to that deity, and that Moses spread the ashes from a furnace (which is the usual Biblical type for Israel's thraldom in Egypt), likewise in the air, but not to call forth a blessing, but a severe punishment of God. However, if the ceremony of spreading ashes in the air was a usual symbol for producing a certain effect over the whole land, we require no analogy to explain it; and if individuals with "light reddish hair" were chosen for that horrid rite, they cannot have been Israelites, to whom that quality does not apply, save by exception.

11. *And the interpreters of secret signs could not stand before Moses because of the boils;* therefore they could not even try their arts; they were included in this plague, as in all the others, without being able to avert the calamity. The suppo-

Pharaoh. 9. And it shall [1]be like dust in all the land of Egypt, and shall be a boil breaking forth *with* blains upon man and upon beast, throughout all the land of Egypt. 10. And they took soot of the furnace, and stood before Pharaoh: and Moses sprinkled it up towards heaven; and it became a boil breaking forth *with* blains upon man and upon beast. 11. And the interpreters of secret signs could not stand before Moses because of the boils: for the boils were upon the interpreters of secret signs, and upon all the Egyptians. 12. And the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh, and he hearkened not to them, as the Lord had spoken to Moses.—13. And the Lord said to Moses,

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Become small dust.

sition of Ebn Ezra, that during the former plagues they knew, by their acquaintance with the natural sciences, how to secure for themselves an alleviation of the evils, is open to the objection that, if so, they would certainly have shared, with Pharaoh at least, the benefit of this superior knowledge; and yet the king appears everywhere to have been among the greatest sufferers. Besides, it is repeatedly stated in the narrative of the preceding plagues, that they would fall upon *Pharaoh's servants*, among whom the magicians are included. In this, the sixth plague, the fact that the Egyptian priests participated in its odious effects, seems to have been expressly mentioned, from the reason that that caste considered the most scrupulous cleanliness as a part of their superior sanctity. Therefore they carefully shaved the whole body every three days, as the hair might possibly harbour vermin; they performed ablutions several times every day, bathing twice a day, and as often during the night, and wore, during their priestly functions, no garments except of the finest linen, because wool might conceal either filth or insects. They must, therefore, have been particularly horror-struck at an infliction which covers the whole body with ulcerous matter of the most hideous nature. But the whole Egyptian people took a particular pride in cultivating habits of cleanliness, and hence is explicable the aversion with which they looked upon those foreigners who allowed their hair and beards to grow, especially the Greeks, who were, from the times of Homer, famous for their long and beautiful hair, and to whom that poet applies the standing epithet: καρηκομόωντες Ἀχαιοί; and Herodotus (ii. 41, 91) asserts, that no Egyptian of either sex, would, on any account, kiss the lips of a Greek, make use of his knife, his spit and cauldron, or taste the flesh of an animal which had been slaughtered by his hand.—Pharaoh did not request Moses to pray for him in this calamity (as he did at the fifth plague), perhaps because, as Ebn Ezra remarks, it did not last long.

12. *And the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh.* Here, for the first time, is the obstinacy of Pharaoh, after the general remark in iv. 21, referred to God. We are justified in concluding from this fact, that Pharaoh's sin preceded and provoked God's punishments, which, however, far from moving his stubborn heart, tended, by the leniency of their character, to harden it still more, and to bring him into a self-conscious opposition to the God of Israel.

אֶל־מֹשֶׁה הַשְׁכֵּם בַּבֹּקֶר וְהִתְיַצֵּב לִפְנֵי פַרְעֹה וְאָמַרְתָּ אֵלָיו כֹּה־
אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הָעִבְרִים שַׁלַּח אֶת־עַמִּי וְיַעַבְדֻנִי׃ 14 כִּי ׀ בַּפַּעַם
הַזֹּאת אֲנִי שֹׁלֵחַ אֶת־כָּל־מַגֵּפֹתַי אֶל־לִבְּךָ וּבַעֲבָדֶיךָ וּבְעַמֶּךָ
בַּעֲבוּר תֵּדַע כִּי אֵין כָּמֹנִי בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ׃ 15 כִּי עַתָּה שָׁלַחְתִּי
אֶת־יָדִי וָאַךְ אוֹתְךָ וְאֶת־עַמְּךָ בַּדָּבֶר וַתִּכָּחֵד מִן־הָאָרֶץ׃
16 וְאוּלָם בַּעֲבוּר זֹאת הֶעֱמַדְתִּיךָ בַּעֲבוּר הַרְאֹתְךָ אֶת־כֹּחִי

Seventh Plague. Hail (ברד). Ver. 13—34.

13. Six plagues, with increasing vehemence, had proved ineffectual, to work a change on that perverse pride of the Egyptian monarch, which impotently exclaims: "Mine is the Nile, and I have made it" (Ezek. xxix. 9). The long-suffering of God had mercifully allowed him ample time to convince himself of the weakness and insignificance of his idols, compared with the Lord of Hosts; but in vain; and other, and still more awful chastisements were necessary, if not to reform his haughty mind, at least to bend his inflexible will. Why God did not work this ulterior effect by one severe overwhelming punishment, instead of ten successive blows, is answered in our text: "in order to show Pharaoh the whole power of God, and to make His glory resound throughout the earth." However, here begin those plagues which spread horror and awe over the country, and which destroy not only the property but the lives of the Egyptians. The hail, mixed with thunder and terrific bolts of lightning, cause such devastation in the fields and such ravages among men and beasts, that the stubbornness of Pharaoh is so much curbed as to exclaim: "I have sinned; the Lord is righteous, and I and my people are wicked," and to request Moses anew to pray for the cessation of the calamity—although his obtuse heart proved again incapable of repentance and atonement.—That hail is not unusual in Egypt is acknowledged in our text (vers. 18, 24), but none of the geographers or travellers relate such destructive qualities of this phenomenon as are described to have taken place in this miracle. According to verses 31 and 32, it occurred in the season when the barley was in ear, and the flax bolled, but when wheat and rye were not in such a forward state, that is, in the beginning of the year, in March. For "in Egypt the barley is gathered in the sixth month after sowing, wheat in the seventh" (Pliny xviii. 7), and, as all grain is, in that country, sown at the same time, in October, barley comes to maturity in March, and wheat in April, a chronological date which admirably agrees with the time of the Exodus. During their sojourn in Alexandria, Wansleben and Monconys witnessed thunder-storms in the month of January, the former, on the 1st, the latter on the 17th and 18th of the month; the tempest was accompanied with hail. Perry also observes, that it hails in January and February in Kairo, although but seldom. Pococke and Korte witnessed at Fium, in February, rain-showers mixed with hail-stones. Bruce heard, in Cossir, during the roaring of the wind, throughout the whole month of February, and a little later, along the Arabian gulph, the crash of the thunder. In March, tempest-storms are of no rare occurrence at Kairo (*Hartmann*, Geography of Africa, p. 141; Déscript. de l' Egypte, xvii. p. 135; xviii. 2, 510; xix. p. 457). Whilst we have thus an abundance of testimonials as to the frequency of hail- and thunder-storms in the three first months of the year, we find the same unanimity with regard to the general mildness and harmlessness of

Rise early in the morning, and step before Pharaoh, and say to him, Thus saith the Lord God of the Hebrews, Let my people go, that they may serve me. 14. For this time I shall send all my plagues upon thy heart, and against thy servants, and against thy people; that thou mayest know that *there is* none like me in all the earth. 15. [1]For now I might have stretched out my hand, and might have smitten thee and thy people with pestilence; and thou wouldst have been cut off from the earth. 16. But only for this cause [2]have I let thee exist, in order to show [3]thee

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—For now I will stretch out my hand, that I may smite thee and thy people with pestilence; and thou shalt be cut off from the earth.
[2] I raised thee up. [3] In thee.

these phenomena. Du Bois Aymé (Déscript. xvii. 135) remarks, that the thunder which occurred in Egypt during his stay there was so weak and gentle that several persons who were with him at the same time did not hear or notice it. During the visit of Thevenot in Egypt, there was a thunder-storm which killed a man; this was an occurrence so uncommon and unparalleled that nobody was able to explain it, and it caused universal consternation. If we compare herewith the fearful character of the same phenomena as described in our text (ver. 25), we can obviously perceive its miraculous nature, which is again enhanced by the circumstance that they occurred and ceased at the command of Moses (ver. 33), and that the Hebrews were exempted from their effects (ver. 26). About the rarity of rain in Egypt, see on verse 33.

14. *For this time I shall send all my plagues upon thy heart;* that is, I shall now inflict upon thee such a combination of awful punishments—hail, and thunder, and fires of lightning, and torrents of rain, in fact, all the united horrors of nature, that thy heart, hitherto proud and inflexible, but now overpowered by these signs of my majesty, will feel its weakness, and acknowledge my superiority over all the deities worshipped by men. בפעם הזאת is, therefore, to be referred to the present plague (not to that of the first-born, as Rashi explains); מגפתי is to be taken in its more primitive signification from נגף to strike, to blow (Sept. συναντήματα), and אל־לבך is literally to be understood upon thy heart; not "upon thee," as Vater and Gesenius believe, although לב is sometimes used in the sense of a personal pronoun, like נפש, פנים, and other substantives; for instance, in the phrase אמר בלבו "he said to himself." Compare Ennius ap. Gellium vii. 2 "quem credidit esse *meum cor.*" That אל לבך is not to be taken quite personally is obvious from the change of the preposition in ובעבדיך and ובעמך.

15. *For now I might have stretched out* (שלחתי) *my hand and might have smitten* (ואך) *thee.* The preterites שלחתי and ואך can signify—1. The subjunctive of the pluperfect, as in Isa. i. 9, לולי הותיר "if He had not left." See Numb. xiv. 2; Job. x. 19; and so in our passage here Ainsworth, Houbigant, Clarke, and others. 2. The possibility or power to perform an action (see *Glass*, Phil. Sacr. p. 197): and we have translated accordingly, rejecting the rendering of the Sept., Vulg., Engl. Vers., and others: "For I will stretch out my hand," etc. Onk. paraphrases: "Because I was now on the point to stretch out."—כחד in Piel and Hiphil, originally to cover, to hide (Job xx. 12); therefore to make disappear, to cut off (Exod. xxiii. 23; Zechar. xi. 8).

16. ואולם *but, however.* Gen. xxviii.

וּלְמַעַן סַפֵּר שְׁמִי בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ׃ שביעי 17 עוֹדְךָ מִסְתּוֹלֵל בְּעַמִּי
לְבִלְתִּי שַׁלְּחָם׃ 18 הִנְנִי מַמְטִיר כָּעֵת מָחָר בָּרָד כָּבֵד מְאֹד אֲשֶׁר
לֹא־הָיָה כָמֹהוּ בְּמִצְרַיִם לְמִן־הַיּוֹם הִוָּסְדָה וְעַד־עָתָּה׃ 19 וְעַתָּה
שְׁלַח הָעֵז אֶת־מִקְנְךָ וְאֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר לְךָ בַּשָּׂדֶה כָּל־הָאָדָם
וְהַבְּהֵמָה אֲשֶׁר־יִמָּצֵא בַשָּׂדֶה וְלֹא יֵאָסֵף הַבַּיְתָה וְיָרַד עֲלֵהֶם
הַבָּרָד וָמֵתוּ׃ 20 הַיָּרֵא אֶת־דְּבַר יְהוָה מֵעַבְדֵי פַּרְעֹה הֵנִיס
אֶת־עֲבָדָיו וְאֶת־מִקְנֵהוּ אֶל־הַבָּתִּים׃ 21 וַאֲשֶׁר לֹא־שָׂם לִבּוֹ אֶל־
דְּבַר יְהוָה וַיַּעֲזֹב אֶת־עֲבָדָיו וְאֶת־מִקְנֵהוּ בַּשָּׂדֶה׃ פ
22 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה נְטֵה אֶת־יָדְךָ עַל־הַשָּׁמַיִם וִיהִי בָרָד
בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם עַל־הָאָדָם וְעַל־הַבְּהֵמָה וְעַל כָּל־עֵשֶׂב הַשָּׂדֶה
בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 23 וַיֵּט מֹשֶׁה אֶת־מַטֵּהוּ עַל־הַשָּׁמַיִם וַיהוָה נָתַן

19, more frequent in Job. בעבור ..... בעבור *for the reason* ..... *in order to.*—עמד in Hiphil *to let stand, to preserve.* See 1 Kings xv. 4; Prov. xxix. 4.—*In order to show thee* (הראתך) *my power.* The Sept., Vulg., Luther, Engl. Vers. and others translate: "in order to show *in* thee my power," after the analogy of לא יגורך, in Ps. v. 5: "there shall not remain *with* thee," and of similar phrases. But the usual construction of הראה with the accusative is here preferable.—*And that my name may be declared* (ולמען ספר). למען with the infinitive as in x. 1.—God multiplied, in an ascending gradation, the plagues against Pharaoh, in order to prove, by their peculiar character, not only to Pharaoh, but to all the nations of the earth, that He favours His worshippers and destroys those who obstinately disregard him. Pharaoh was preserved by the forbearance of God, in the midst of many fearful plagues; and so he became a more signal example afterwards.

17. *As yet exaltest thou thyself* (מסתולל) *against my people.* מסתולל from סלל to lift up, to elevate; therefore in *Hithpolel* to rise, to stand up; and with ב, to stand against somebody; and thus it assumes the signification of *resisting;* although it may not exactly include the metaphor of "opposing oneself like a mound," connected with סללה a mound, as Gesenius and de Wette take it; for סללה is a verbal substantive *derived* from סלל. *Targum Onkelos:* "Still thou keepest my people in servitude." Thus also Rashi and Vulgate. *Sept:* "thou insultest my people"; *Ebn Ezra:* "thou gloriest thyself against my people"—all expressing the general sense rather than the peculiar meaning of the word.

18. *About this time to-morrow.* Comp. Gen. xviii. 10.—לְמִן־הַיּוֹם הִוָּסְדָה literally "from the day of its being founded" (Inf. Niph. of יסד orig. פ״ו with ה raphatum instead of הּ with mappik); and the same idea is, in ver. 24, expressed with the words, מאז היתה לגוי "since it became a nation;" that is, since Egypt was inhabited. למן = מן; see Deut. iv. 32. The violent character of hail- and thunder-storms is unusual in Egypt, although these phenomena are in themselves not uncommon in that country. See ver. 13.

19. העז את־מקנך. *Bring in safety* (הָעֵז) *thy cattle.* עוז to flee for refuge;

my power, and that my name may be acknowledged throughout all the earth. 17. As yet exaltest thou thyself against my people, that thou wilt not let them go. 18. Behold, to-morrow about this time I shall cause it to rain a very heavy hail, such as hath not been in Egypt since the day of its foundation even until now. 19. Send therefore now, *and* [1]bring in safety thy cattle, and all that thou hast in the field; *for* upon every man and beast which will be found in the field, and will not be gathered into the house, the hail will come down upon them, and they will die. 20. He who feared the word of the Lord among the servants of Pharaoh made his servants and his cattle flee into the houses. 21. But he who regarded not the word of the Lord left his servants and his cattle in the field. 22. And the Lord said to Moses, Stretch forth thy hand towards heaven, that there may be hail in all the land of Egypt, upon man and upon beast, and upon every herb of the field, throughout the land of Egypt. 23. And Moses stretched forth his [2]staff towards heaven: and the Lord sent thunder and hail, and [3]fire came down upon the

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Gather. [2] Rod. [3] Fire ran along upon the ground.

therefore מָעוֹז refuge; and Hiphil, to bring in safety (like the German phrase: "Seine Habe flüchten." *Gesen.*). The verb הנִים in ver. 20 (from נוּם to flee, מָנוֹם refuge), is synonymous with הָעִיז; comp. Isa. x. 31; Jer. iv. 6; vi. 1; Luther correctly: "Verwahre dein Vieh." The renderings, therefore, of the Septuagint (*κατάσπευσον συναγαγεῖν*), Onk. (כנוש), Ebn Ezra (כנס), Rashi and Rashbam (אסוף) *gather in*, are too vague. In the first four months of the year (that is during the season, when the seventh plague took place, see ver. 13), the cattle is sent out to pasture in the fields, whilst during the remaining part of the year it feeds on dry food (*Niebuhr*, Trav. p. 142; *Hartmann*, p. 232; Déscr. de l'Eg. xvii. p. 126).

20. We have to supply here, that Moses executed the command of God and announced the plague to Pharaoh; and the Samaritan codex has here, as in similar preceding passages, an addition to that effect. See note to vii. 18. "This was a test for Moses to prove, how far the fear of that God, in whose name he had come, had already found access to the minds of the Egyptians."

22. אֶל־הַשָּׁמַיִם = עַל הַשָּׁמַיִם. See Jer. xxiii. 35.

23. *And fire came down upon the earth.* אֵשׁ *fire*, namely, lightning, as 1 Kings xviii. 38; Job i. 16, etc. The Engl. Vers. renders strangely: "fire ran along upon the ground," (precisely as Ebn Ezra remarks: "the fire here went on the ground, contrary to its nature, which makes it ascend upwards"); which interpretation is already precluded by the ה locale in ארצה which denotes a direction *to* a place. תִּהֲלַךְ instead of תֵּהָלֵךְ like in Ps. lxxiii. 9; See *Ew.* Crit. Gram. p. 444. The verb הלך is used of the descending of lightning likewise in Job xxxviii. 35 (התשלח ברקים וילכו).

קֹלֹת וּבָרָד וַתִּהֲלַךְ־אֵשׁ אָרְצָה וַיַּמְטֵר יְהוָה בָּרָד עַל־אֶרֶץ
מִצְרָיִם׃ 24 וַיְהִי בָרָד וְאֵשׁ מִתְלַקַּחַת בְּתוֹךְ הַבָּרָד כָּבֵד מְאֹד
אֲשֶׁר לֹא־הָיָה כָמֹהוּ בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מֵאָז הָיְתָה לְגוֹי׃ 25 וַיַּךְ
הַבָּרָד בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׂדֶה מֵאָדָם וְעַד־בְּהֵמָה
וְאֵת כָּל־עֵשֶׂב הַשָּׂדֶה הִכָּה הַבָּרָד וְאֶת־כָּל־עֵץ הַשָּׂדֶה שִׁבֵּר׃
26 רַק בְּאֶרֶץ גֹּשֶׁן אֲשֶׁר־שָׁם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא הָיָה בָּרָד׃
27 וַיִּשְׁלַח פַּרְעֹה וַיִּקְרָא לְמֹשֶׁה וּלְאַהֲרֹן וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם חָטָאתִי
הַפָּעַם יְהוָה הַצַּדִּיק וַאֲנִי וְעַמִּי הָרְשָׁעִים׃ 28 הַעְתִּירוּ אֶל־יְהוָה
וְרַב מִהְיֹת קֹלֹת אֱלֹהִים וּבָרָד וַאֲשַׁלְּחָה אֶתְכֶם וְלֹא תֹסִפוּן
לַעֲמֹד׃ 29 וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו מֹשֶׁה כְּצֵאתִי אֶת־הָעִיר אֶפְרֹשׂ אֶת־כַּפַּי
אֶל־יְהוָה הַקֹּלוֹת יֶחְדָּלוּן וְהַבָּרָד לֹא יִהְיֶה־עוֹד לְמַעַן תֵּדַע כִּי
לַיהוָה הָאָרֶץ׃ 30 וְאַתָּה וַעֲבָדֶיךָ יָדַעְתִּי כִּי טֶרֶם תִּירְאוּן מִפְּנֵי
יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים׃ 31 וְהַפִּשְׁתָּה וְהַשְּׂעֹרָה נֻכָּתָה כִּי הַשְּׂעֹרָה אָבִיב

24. *So there was hail, and continuous fire in the midst of the hail.* אש מתלקחת like fire, that is, flashes of lightning, one *taking up* or following the other, i.e. continuous, incessant lightning. Targ. Onk. renders: אישתא משתלהבא and Sept. *πῦρ φλογίζον flaming* fire; Vulgate: "grando et ignis mista," "fire mingled with the hail;" so also Luther, Engl. Vers. Vater, Rosenm., Philippson, and others without regard to the etymology of the word. Zunz and Arnheim, a spreading fire ("ein um sich greifendes Feuer"), which would include *conflagrations;* Gesenius, De Wette and Maurer: conglomerated fire or balls of fire, which would impart to the words a character not hinted at in the text.— מֵאָז originally a preposition, here used as a conjunction instead of מאז אשר, as in v. 23.

25. About *every* herb, and *every* tree, see on ver. 6.

27. *I have sinned this time;* that is, as Nachmanides explains: "This time I acknowledge that I have sinned."

28. ורב מהית קלת The preposition מן which is contained in מהית shows that רב is to be taken as a comparative: *it is too much already,* that there should be more thunderings (plus est quam ut). Rashi expresses only the sense: "thunder enough has already come down;" and so Mendelssohn, Zunz, and many others. The Septuagint, Vulgate, and Luther translate too freely: "that the thunders of the Lord may cease" (*παυσάσθω τοῦ γενηθῆναι φωνὰς Θεοῦ*, ut desinant tonitrua Dei). Targ. Onk. renders קלת אלהים thus: "the thunders of *curse* like those which come from God."—*And you shall stay no longer,* pray forthwith to the Lord. Ebn Ezra remarks: "In the words—*pray to the Lord* (העתירו אל יהוה), Pharaoh used the holy name of God, whilst he called the thunder קלת אלהים; because he acknowledged only the existence of אלהים, and therefore Moses combined both names in a subsequent verse: 'you do not yet fear יהוה אלהים'" (ver. 30).

29. Moses went out of the town in order to pray, either because the solitude enhanced his devotion, or (according to

earth; and the Lord rained hail upon the land of Egypt.
24. So there was hail, and [1]continuous fire in the midst
of the hail, very heavy, such as there was none like it in
all the land of Egypt since it became a nation. 25. And
the hail smote throughout all the land of Egypt all that
was in the field, both man and beast; and the hail smote
every herb of the field, and broke every tree of the field.
26. Only in the land of Goshen, where the children of
Israel *were*, there was no hail. 27. And Pharaoh sent,
and called for Moses and Aaron, and said to them, I have
sinned this time: the Lord *is* righteous, and I and my
people are wicked. 28. Entreat the Lord, [2]for it is
already too much to be more thunderings and hail; and I
will let you go, and you shall stay no longer. 29. And
Moses said to him, When I am gone out of the city, I shall
spread out my hands to the Lord; *and* the thunder will
cease, neither will there be any more hail, that thou
mayest know that the earth is the Lord's. 30. But
as for thee and thy servants, I know [3]that you do not
yet fear the Lord God. (31. And the flax and the
barley were smitten; for the barley *was in* the ear, and

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Fire mingled with the hail. [2] For *it is* enough that there be no *more* mighty thunderings, etc. [3] That ye will not yet fear.

the Midrash) because the town was infested with idols.—Glaire thinks that כצאתי את העיר is a *constructio prægnans*—and that the verb עָזַב is to be understood before את העיר. But the construction of יצא with the accusative occurs also in Gen. xliv. 4 (יצאו את העיר); Job xxix. 7; etc. Comp. in Latin "egredi urbem," or "urbem evadere."—פרש כפים to spread out the hands, i.e. to pray, wherefore Targum Jonathan adds: בצלו, in prayer. See Isaiah i. 15.—*The thunder shall cease.* This sudden cessation of the plague by the will of God was eminently calculated to manifest to the king of Egypt His paramount power over all the elements and the whole earth, which authority was not—as that of the idols was considered to be—confined to one country or to any one part of the world.

30. About the construction in ואתה ועבדיך ידעתי כי, see note to iv. 14. —*That you do not yet fear the Lord God.* טרם means *not yet*, and Onkelos translates correctly: עד כען לא "hitherto not." Saadiah and Ebn Ezra take טרם in the sense of *before*, and connect this sentence with the following verse: "already, before you feared the Lord, your flax and barley were smitten, and I can therefore not pray for their restoration," which interpretation must be considered as forced.

31, 32. *And the flax* פשתה (Linum usitatissimum). It was in ancient times, as it is now, much cultivated in Egypt, in the well-known square beds; especially in the Delta, in the vicinity of Pelusium (Linum Pelusiacum); the stalks reach a height of more than three feet, and the thickness of cane (compare *Herod.* ii. 105;

קֹלֹת וּבָרָד וַתִּהֲלַךְ־אֵשׁ אָרְצָה וַיַּמְטֵר יְהוָה בָּ
מִצְרָיִם׃ 24 וַיְהִי בָרָד וְאֵשׁ מִתְלַקַּחַת בְּתוֹךְ הַבָּרָ
אֲשֶׁר לֹא־הָיָה כָמֹהוּ בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מֵאָז הָיְתָה לְ
הַבָּרָד בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׂדֶה מֵאָדָם
וְאֵת כָּל־עֵשֶׂב הַשָּׂדֶה הִכָּה הַבָּרָד וְאֶת־כָּל־עֵץ הַשָּׂ
26 רַק בְּאֶרֶץ גֹּשֶׁן אֲשֶׁר־שָׁם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא הָ
27 וַיִּשְׁלַח פַּרְעֹה וַיִּקְרָא לְמֹשֶׁה וּלְאַהֲרֹן וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶ
הַפָּעַם יְהוָה הַצַּדִּיק וַאֲנִי וְעַמִּי הָרְשָׁעִים׃ 28 הַעְתִּירוּ
וְרַב מִהְיֹת קֹלֹת אֱלֹהִים וּבָרָד וַאֲשַׁלְּחָה אֶתְכֶם וְלֹ
לַעֲמֹד׃ 29 וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו מֹשֶׁה כְּצֵאתִי אֶת־הָעִיר אֶפְרֹשׂ
אֶל־יְהוָה הַקֹּלוֹת יֶחְדָּלוּן וְהַבָּרָד לֹא יִהְיֶה־עוֹד לְמַעַן
לַיהוָה הָאָרֶץ׃ 30 וְאַתָּה וַעֲבָדֶיךָ יָדַעְתִּי כִּי טֶרֶם תִּירְאוּ
יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים׃ 31 וְהַפִּשְׁתָּה וְהַשְּׂעֹרָה נֻכָּתָה כִּי הַשְּׂעֹרָה

So there was hail, and continuous ... *the midst of the hail.* אש מתלקחת ...e, that is, flashes of lightning, one ... *up* or following the other, i.e. con...us, incessant lightning. Targ. Onk. ...rs: אישתא משתלהבא and Sept. ... φλογίζον *flaming* fire; Vulgate: ...ando et ignis mista," "fire mingled ... the hail;" so also Luther, Engl. Vers. ...ter, Rosenm., Philippson, and others ...thout regard to the etymology of the ...ord, Zunz and Arnheim, a spreading ...re ("ein um sich greifendes Feuer"), ...hich would include *conflagrations*; Ge...enius, De Wette and Maurer: conglom...rated fire or balls of ...e, which would ...t to the words ... r not hinted ...text. — 28 ... a prepo... used a... instead ... as ir... *ever*... tre... ...*nned* ... expl... hav... ...ור

מן which is contained in מהית shows that רב is to be taken as a comparative: *it is too much already*, that there should be more thunderings (plus est quam ut). Rashi expresses only the sense: "thunder enough has already come down;" and so Mendelssohn, Zunz, and many others. The Septuagint, Vulgate, and Luther translate too freely: "that the thunders of the Lord may cease" (*παυσάσθω τοῦ γενηθῆναι φωνὰς* Θεοῦ, ut desinant tonitrua Dei). Targ. Onk. renders קלת אלהים thus: "the thunders of *curse* like those which come from God."—*And you shall stay no longer*, pray forthwith to the Lord. Ebn Ezra remarks: "In the words—*pray to the Lord* (העתירו אל יהוה), Pharaoh used the holy name of God, whilst he called the thunder קלת אלהים; because ... acknowledged only the existence of ...אלה, and therefore Moses combined ...h names in a subsequent verse: 'you ...t yet fear יהוה אלהים" (ver. 30).

Moses went out of the town in ...o pray, either because the solitude ...d his devotion, or (according to

he flax *was* bolled. 32.
vere not smitten; for th
vent out of the city fr
iis hands to the Lord; ar
ind the rain was not po
vhen Pharaoh saw that
hunders had ceased, [3]h
iis heart, he and his s
Pharaoh remained hard
children of Israel go, as

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Rye. [2] W

lat, that Herodotus distinctly say
ıever rains in that country" (
'Egypt enjoys such fruitfulness," o
Pliny, "that she owes nothing to
he skies." Mela calls Egypt '
mbrium;" Lucilius says: "Ne
orum aspicit coelum," and '
'nec pluvio supplicat herba Iovi
ery construction of the houses
f mere crude bricks, shows th
ain, which, if it had fallen
n great quantity, would soo
langered the safety of the edi
lthough modern travellers
imes witnessed rain in tha
ras so lenient and excited s
ıent among the inhabitant
howers fell about five or six
ourse of the year, and a co
f heavy rain is quite un
an well understand the for
ve of this plague, whic
ther more formidable phe
rrents of rain as an ungr
iment.—לא־נתך *was not*
נָתַךְ to pour, Job. iii. 24;
hus Ebn Ezra and Ras
v. *Vulg.* stillavit.

34. *And he continue*
rpreters explain: Be
knowledged God, s
ghteous, but he himse
d yet resisted His

וְהַפִּשְׁתָּה גִּבְעֹל׃ 32 וְהַחִטָּה וְהַכֻּסֶּמֶת לֹא נֻכּוּ כִּי אֲפִילֹת
הֵנָּה׃ מפטיר 33 וַיֵּצֵא מֹשֶׁה מֵעִם פַּרְעֹה אֶת־הָעִיר וַיִּפְרֹשׂ
כַּפָּיו אֶל־יְהוָה וַיַּחְדְּלוּ הַקֹּלוֹת וְהַבָּרָד וּמָטָר לֹא־נִתַּךְ אָרְצָה׃
34 וַיַּרְא פַּרְעֹה כִּי־חָדַל הַמָּטָר וְהַבָּרָד וְהַקֹּלֹת וַיֹּסֶף לַחֲטֹא
וַיַּכְבֵּד לִבּוֹ הוּא וַעֲבָדָיו׃ 35 וַיֶּחֱזַק לֵב פַּרְעֹה וְלֹא שִׁלַּח אֶת־בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה בְּיַד־מֹשֶׁה׃ פ

Pliny, xix. 1, 2). See our Introduction to chap. xxv.: "The Holy Tabernacle;" II. C. i. We have there remarked on the very extensive use made of flax, and the various purposes to which linen was applied. Egypt was, in fact, the great linen market of the ancient world; and thus the enormity of the loss occasioned by the seventh plague will readily be estimated.—שערה *barley* was both in Egypt and Palestine extensively sown, in October and the beginning of November; it ripened in March, and was generally cut in April. It was partly used as food for animals, especially horses, partly for bread for the poorer classes, and for the preparation of a common beverage. The barley-bread was considered very wholesome, though not so nutritious as that of wheat; and the Arabs in Morocco eat, at present, exclusively unleavened barley-bread.—*The barley was in the ear*, באביב=אביב, and so the flax, בגבעל=גבעל. Comp. Numb. xxx. 17; Cant. ii. 13. אביב *ear of corn*, from אבב which signifies in the Semitic dialects *to produce blossoms or fruits;* therefore the vernal month (April, ניסן) is called חדש האביב. Exod. xiii. 4; xxiii. 15; xxxiv. 18, etc. Ebn Ezra (ad xiii. 4), derives it less probably from אב parent, in the signification of בכור firstling, namely of barley. The Septuagint renders there: *ἐν μηνὶ τῶν νέων* (scil. *σταχύων*); Vulg.: "mense novarum frugum."—גבעל (from גביע, calix, with the formative or diminutive termination ל) corolla of flowers. Sept. *σπερματίζον* giving seed, having already the seed-cups.—*And the wheat* החטה which, as is universally known, was the most cultivated grain in Asia and Egypt. *And the spelt* הכסמת Triticum Spelta Linn., with a four-leaved blunted calix, small blossoms, with little awns, and smooth, as it were, shorn, slender ears, the grains of which sit so firmly in the husks that they must be freed from them by peculiar devices; it grows about as high as barley, and is extensively cultivated in the southern countries of Europe, in Egypt, Arabia and Palestine, in more than one species. The Septuagint translates it by *ὄλυρα*, in Pliny "arinca," which corresponds with the French *riguet;* and Herodotus (ii. 36) observes, that it was used by the Egyptians for baking bread. These *were not smitten, for they are later.* אפיל orig. weak, tender, slow in growing, therefore later in the season. Wheat and spelt are still backward in March, when flax and barley are already ripe for the sickle (see note on ver. 13). Rashi and Kimchi explain, therefore, correctly, מאוחרות, Sept. *ὄψιμα*, Vulg. "serotina," Luther, "Spaetgetreide," and similarly nearly all the modern interpreters. Ebn Ezra derives אפיל from אפל dark, and explains: the wheat and spelt were still hidden in the earth, they had not yet sprouted forth; which is, however, impossible, as they are in their growth only one month behind flax and barley. Wheat and spelt were still tender and flexible, and, therefore, yielded to the violence of the hail and rain, and remained uninjured; whilst the hard, stiff and dry stalks of flax and barley were, by their resistance, easily broken and destroyed.

33. *And the rain was not poured upon the earth.* Rain is so seldom in Egypt, especially in those parts which lie low and

the flax *was* bolled. 32. But the wheat and the [1]spelt were not smitten; for they [2]*are* later.) 33. And Moses went out of the city from Pharaoh, and spread out his hands to the Lord; and the thunders and hail ceased, and the rain was not poured upon the earth. 34. But when Pharaoh saw that the rain and the hail and the thunders had ceased, [3]he continued to sin, and hardened his heart, he and his servants. 35. And the heart of Pharaoh remained hardened, and he would not let the children of Israel go, as the Lord had spoken by Moses.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Rye. [2] Were not grown up. [3] He sinned yet more.

flat, that Herodotus distinctly says: "it never rains in that country" (ii. 14). "Egypt enjoys such fruitfulness," observes Pliny, "that she owes nothing to rain or the skies." Mela calls Egypt "expers imbrium;" Lucilius says: "Nemo aratorum aspicit coelum," and Tibullus: "nec pluvio supplicat herba Iovi." The very construction of the houses in Egypt, of mere crude bricks, shows the rarity of rain, which, if it had fallen often and in great quantity, would soon have endangered the safety of the edifices. And, although modern travellers have sometimes witnessed rain in that country, it was so lenient and excited such astonishment among the inhabitants, (at Thebes showers fell about five or six times in the course of the year, and a continued storm of heavy rain is quite unusual) that we can well understand the force of the narrative of this plague, which had, besides other more formidable phenomena, violent torrents of rain as an ungrateful accompaniment.—לֹא־נִתַּךְ *was not poured*, Niph. of נָתַךְ to pour, Job. iii. 24; Jer. xlii. 18, etc. Thus Ebn Ezra and Rashbam. *Sept. ἐσταξεν. Vulg.* stillavit.

34. ***And he continued to sin.*** Some interpreters explain: Because Pharaoh had acknowledged God, saying, that He is righteous, but he himself wicked (ver. 27), and yet resisted His commands, he is henceforth a wanton, intentional sinner (מזיד), and, therefore, still more criminal; and the English Version translates accordingly: "and he sinned yet more." Although certainly the weight of Pharaoh's guilt became greater, the more numerous the corrections were, to which he obstinately resisted, especially when a conviction of his criminal conduct had come over him; the Hebrew words (ויסף לחטא) imply simply a *continuation* of the same sin, a repetition of the former refusal to allow the departure of the Israelites; and they are equivalent to the phrase: "Pharaoh hardened his heart this time also" (גם בפעם הזאת viii. 28).

35. Calvin finds in the concluding words of this verse: "as the Lord had spoken by Moses," an intimation of the circumstance, that Moses communicated to Pharaoh the divine prediction of his obstinacy, and that, therefore, here is again a significant progress in the narrative. But the context does not justify such assumption. If Moses made any communication concerning the predicted continuance of Pharaoh's stubbornness, he made it to the Israelites, not to Pharaoh, upon whom it would have worked a very undesirable effect, although even the former alternative is not necessarily implied in the word ביד *through* or *by*.

פ פ פ

י 1 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָֹה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה בֹּא אֶל־פַּרְעֹה כִּי־אֲנִי הִכְבַּדְתִּי אֶת־

CHAPTERS X. XI.

Summary.—Swarms of *locusts* are announced by Moses as the eighth plague. The officers of Pharaoh, dismayed at the predicted infliction, earnestly warn him to yield at last to the wish of the Israelites. Moses and Aaron appear again before the king; but on hearing their request, that all the Israelites, with their wives, children, and cattle, wished to go to celebrate a festival to the Lord, he expelled them from his presence. Enormous swarms of locusts are, from Arabia, brought over Egypt by an east-wind; they desolate the whole vegetation of the land, and all the horrors of an impending famine torment the minds of the Egyptians. The king sends once more for Moses and Aaron, confesses his wickedness, asks them to pray for the discontinuance of this calamity; a strong west-wind drives the locusts back; all their swarms perish in the Red Sea;—but Pharaoh remains hardened and treacherous.—As a transition to the last and most awful plague a calamity is introduced—dense *darkness* during three days—more calculated to fill the minds of the Egyptians with a deep sense of their helplessness before the Lord of Israel, than to inflict real injury upon them; and, indeed, Pharaoh makes another concession, allowing the children to accompany their parents into the wilderness; but when Moses and Aaron firmly insist upon taking with them all their cattle also for sacrifices, Pharaoh forbids them, under penalty of death, ever to appear again before him.—Moses promises this energetically, having already received the revelation concerning the last plague, the death of all the firstborn in Egypt, which calamity he now emphatically announces to Pharaoh, adding that the Israelites will leave the land unhurt by the pestilence, honoured and enriched by the Egyptians, and urged on even by the king himself.—Moses leaves Pharaoh with indignation. A brief summary of the preceding plagues, and their inefficiency upon the heart of Pharaoh, is annexed as a transition or preparation for the last infliction (see xi. 1, 9).

Eighth Plague. Locusts (ארבה). Ver. 1—20.

1. The eighth plague, consisting in immense cloud-darkening hosts of voracious locusts, filled in its very announcement the people of Egypt with such horror, that they murmuringly requested the king, at last to dismiss the Israelites; for the land was already ruined.—We have a variety of faithful and interesting descriptions of these insects, their wanderings, their desolations, and their destruction; but there is none comparable in accuracy of observation and sublimity of poetical delineation, with the exalted picture which the prophet Joel gives in the two first chapters of his prophecies. We shall, therefore, subjoin here some extracts from that description; and we deem this to be the more properly illustrative of our passage, as the one has indeed the character of a more detailed explanation of the other (compare Joel i. 2, and Exodus x. 6; Joel i. 3, and Exodus x. 2, etc.); and we shall then add such other information as might besides be necessary for the illustration of our text. In the translation of these poetical portions, we have been guided by the same principles which we have generally adopted in this part of our labour. Joel i. 6: "For a nation is come upon my land, mighty and numberless, whose teeth are the teeth of a lion, and it hath the bite of a lioness. Ver. 7. It hath laid my vine waste, and broken my fig-tree; it hath barked it bare, and cast it down; white are its tendrils. Ver. 10. The fold is desolated; the land mourneth; for the corn is destroyed; the new wine is dried up; the oil is withered. Ver. 11. Be ye ashamed, O ye husbandmen; lament, O ye vine-dressers, for the wheat and for the barley; for perished is the harvest of the field. Ver. 15. Woe to the day! for the day of the Lord is near, and as a destruction from the Almighty doth it come. Ver. 17. The seeds are rotten under their clods, the garners are desolate, the barns are broken down; for the corn is withered. Ver. 18. How do the beasts groan! in consternation are the herds of cattle,

CHAP. X. 1. And the Lord said to Moses, Go to Pharaoh; for I have hardened his heart, and the heart of his servants, that I might show these my signs [1]among

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Before him.

because there is no pasture for them; the flocks of sheep also are perished. II. 1, 2. The day of the Lord cometh; it is nigh at hand; a day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness. As the morning spreads over the mountains; *so* great *is* the people and strong; never hath there been any like it, neither shall there be any more after it, *even* to the years of many generations. Ver. 3. A fire devoureth before them, and behind them a flame burneth; the land *is* as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness; and nothing can escape them. Ver. 4. Their appearance is as the appearance of horses; and as horsemen so they run. Ver. 5. Like the noise of chariots they leap over the summits of mountains; like the noise of a flame of fire that devoureth the stubble; like a strong army arrayed for battle. Ver. 6. Before them the people trembleth; every countenance groweth pale with horror. Ver. 7. They run like heroes, they climb the wall like warriors; and they march every one its way, and they change not their ranks. Ver. 8. One presseth not the other; they walk every one in its path; and through weapons they pass and break not their lines. Ver. 9. They stray about in the city; they run upon walls; they ascend into the houses; they enter at the windows like a thief. Ver. 10. Before them quaketh the earth, tremble the heavens; the sun and the moon grow dark, and the stars withhold their splendour."—And if you sincerely repent (ver. 20): "I shall remove far from you the northern army, and shall drive it into a land barren and desolate, with its van towards the eastern sea, and with its rear towards the western sea; and its fetid smell shall ascend, and its odours shall rise up, because it hath done so great things."—It will not be uninteresting to compare herewith the description of a modern traveller, which confirms the Biblical picture in every essential point. Volney (Trav. i. p. 235) writes: "With Egypt, Persia, and almost the whole of southern Asia, Syria has a fearful plague in common, namely, those clouds of locusts, of which almost all travellers report. Everybody, except an eye-witness, must deem the enormous quantity of these insects quite incredible; the ground is covered with them for several leagues. The noise which they cause when devouring leaves and grass, is heard at a considerable distance, and seems like the noise of an army foraging in secret. It is certainly much better to fall in with the Tartars, than with these little all-devouring creatures; it might almost be said, that fire accompanies them. Where their swarms appear, everything green vanishes momentarily from the fields, as if a curtain is rolled up; the trees and plants stand leafless, and nothing is seen but naked boughs and stalks, and thus the dreary image of winter follows rapidly on the variegated exuberance of spring. If these locust-clouds move on, in order to fly over an obstacle, which stands in the way of their voraciousness, or still more rapidly, over a waste soil, it can literally be said, that the sky is obscured by them. It is a consolation, that this plague does not occur often, for there is nothing which produces so invariably famine and disease."—We subjoin, besides, a brief extract from the account of Denon, which offers several important analogies with the relation of our text: "Two days later (after the burning south-wind had begun to blow) we were informed, that the plain was covered with birds, which proceeded like one solid body from east to west. Seen from a distance, the field appeared to be in motion, or at least a long stream appeared to flow through the

לִבּוֹ וְאֶת־לֵב עֲבָדָיו לְמַעַן שִׁתִי אֹתֹתַי אֵלֶּה בְּקִרְבּוֹ׃ 2 וּלְמַעַן תְּסַפֵּר
בְּאָזְנֵי בִנְךָ וּבֶן־בִּנְךָ אֵת אֲשֶׁר הִתְעַלַּלְתִּי בְּמִצְרַיִם וְאֶת־אֹתֹתַי
אֲשֶׁר־שַׂמְתִּי בָם וִידַעְתֶּם כִּי־אֲנִי יְהוָה׃ 3 וַיָּבֹא מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן

plain. Believing that these were birds of migration, which thus passed by in very great numbers, we hastened towards that direction to observe them. But instead of birds, we found a cloud of locusts which denuded the field, devouring every blade of grass, and not leaving the spot before it was perfectly stripped of every vegetation. As active, as lively and eager as the Bedouins, they are, like them, children of the desert. After the wind had turned, and became contrary to their flight, they were driven back into the desert."—We shall now introduce some other remarks on the character of this plague. The locust (ἀκρίς, gryllus gregarius, locusta, *Pliny*, ix. 50), has four wings, mostly green or yellowish, spring-feet, and attains a length of about five inches. It has a green thorax, with a much elevated ridge or crest on it, blunted head, red-brown eyes, and antennae about three quarters of an inch long. Their teeth are extremely sharp and strong, and the four teeth of the two jaws cross each other like the two parts of a pair of scissors; and hence they are compared by the prophet Joel with the teeth of a lion. The Arabs, rich and lively as their imagination is, express the terror with which these insects fill them, in several hyperbolical similes. They compare the head of the locust to that of the horse; its breast to that of the lion; its feet to those of the camel; its body to that of the serpent; and its tail to that of the scorpion. When they breed, which is in the month of October, they make a hole in the ground with their tails, and having laid 300 eggs in it, and covered them with their feet, expire; for they never live above six months and a half. Neither rain nor frost, however long and severe, can destroy their eggs; they continue till spring, and, hatched by the heat of the sun, the young locusts issue from the earth about the middle of April. They often cover the ground for the space of several leagues to the depth of four, sometimes of six or seven inches. A swarm, which was observed in India in 1825, occupied a space of forty English square miles, contained at least forty millions of locusts in one line, and cast a long shadow on the earth. And Major Moore thus describes an immense army of these animals which ravaged the Mahratta country: "The column they composed extended five hundred miles; and so compact was it when on the wing, that like an eclipse, it completely hid the sun, so that no shadow was cast by any object." Brown, in his Travels in Africa, states that an area of nearly two thousand square miles was literally covered by them; and Kirby and Spence mention that a column of them was so immense, that they took four hours to fly over the spot where the observer stood. The approach of their swarms is announced by a yellow reflex in the skies, which arises from their yellow wings. If the rays of the sun shine upon them, the earth itself assumes a yellow colour. After they have converted the land into a desert, they proceed in their flight, but leave behind them their eggs, and their excrements, which cause a detestable smell. Remarkable is the extraordinary order and regularity of their swarms. "They fly," says Jerome, "after the will of the all-governing Deity, with such order, that they keep their place like the figures made by the hand of the artist on a pavement, and never in the least deviate to the right or to the left." They fly always in a straight onward direction, mostly northwards, but not always (see on ver. 13). Sometimes they penetrate even into the houses; they fly into the mouths of the inmates; they throw themselves on the food; they gnaw leather

them; 2. And that thou mayest tell in the ears of thy son, and of thy son's son, what things I have wrought in Egypt, and my signs which I have done among them; that you may know that I am the Lord. 3. And Moses

and even wood. It has been unsuccessfully tried to keep them off or to repel them by pits and ditches, crying, drums, smoke, and even soldiers. But though all these devices fail, these formidable insects have a most powerful enemy in certain birds, called *samarmer*, greatly resembling the wood-pecker, which seem to have a natural antipathy to the locusts, for they do not only devour great numbers of them, but destroy them in large quantities, whence they are regarded as great benefactors by the peasants, who never venture to kill or injure one of them. But still more fatal to the locusts are the southerly winds, which drive them over the sea, on which they sit down as on firm ground, or into which they fall, unable to continue their flight on account of damp vapours or rain. But even in their destruction they are a curse to men; for their dead carcases, cast on the shore by the wind, and putrifying on the ground, exhale such pestilential effluvia, that many thousand persons have perished from this cause. Augustine mentions a pestilence produced by dead locusts, which destroyed the lives of about 800,000 people of Numidia, and many more in the countries bordering on the coast. They are, however, in the East, extensively used for food, prepared in various ways, and often preferred to the finest fish. Four kinds of them are allowed for food in the dietetic laws of Moses (Lev. xi. 22, ארבה, סלעם, חרגל, and חגב). Compare *Bochart*, iii. 252, *et seq.*; *Shaw*, Trav. p. 164, *et seq.*; *Niebuhr*, Descript. of Arabia, p. 168, *et seq.*; *Oedman*, Collect. ii. p. 76, *et seq.*; iii. 84, *et seq.*; and especially *Rosenmüller*, Archæol. iv. 2, p. 386—418, and many others.—These facts and descriptions will convey some idea of the formidable character of these insects, whose awful desolations were not unknown to the Egyptians (ver. 14), but which were now brought over the land in unparalleled numbers as a fearful plague, more formidable than boils and hail, and well calculated to terrify both the people and the king of Egypt; because it was not only disastrous in itself, but also in its dire consequence of famine and pestilence.—The reason why God allowed Pharaoh to harden his heart is here stated similarly as in ix. 16, in order to show him His whole power, and to reveal His might to later generations — אתתי אלה, instead of האלה. If the substantive has a suffix, the pronoun frequently remains without the article. — בקרבו, Onkelos correctly, ביניהון; Septuagint, *ἐπ' αὐτούς*, among them (like בם in ver. 2), namely, Pharaoh and his servants.

2. *What things I have wrought in Egypt* (התעללתי). So Onkelos, Rashbam, Luther, Mendelssohn, De Wette, and most of the modern interpreters. But the Septuagint translates, *ὅσα ἐμπέπαιχα τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις*, "how much I have illuded the Egyptians;" and thus Rashi (שׂחקתי, comparing Numb. xxii. 29, and 1 Sam. vi. 6, and asserting, that עלל has only in Kal, not in Hithpael, the signification of acting, performing). But in Psalm cxli. 4, we have distinctly להתעלל עלילות, "to perpetrate evil deeds." The Vulgate renders still more strangely: "Quoties contriverim Ægyptios," how often I have ruined the Egyptians, Jerome having, according to Rosenmüller's shrewd conjecture, understood the explanation of his Hebrew teacher שׂחקתי, instead of שׁחקתי.

3. לֵעָנוֹת. *To humble thyself.* לֵעָנוֹת is Infinitive Niphal of ענה, instead of לְהֵעָנוֹת, as לֵרָאוֹת instead of לְהֵרָאוֹת, xxxiv. 24; or בֵּעָטֵף, instead of בְּהֵעָטֵף, Lam. ii. 11. After the prepositions ב, ל, כ, the ה of the Infinitive Niphal (though less frequently than that of

אֶל־פַּרְעֹה וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלָיו כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הָעִבְרִים עַד־מָתַי
מֵאַנְתָּ לֵעָנֹת מִפָּנָי שַׁלַּח עַמִּי וְיַעַבְדֻנִי׃ 4 כִּי אִם־מָאֵן אַתָּה
לְשַׁלֵּחַ אֶת־עַמִּי הִנְנִי מֵבִיא מָחָר אַרְבֶּה בִּגְבֻלֶךָ׃ 5 וְכִסָּה
אֶת־עֵין הָאָרֶץ וְלֹא יוּכַל לִרְאֹת אֶת־הָאָרֶץ וְאָכַל ׀ אֶת־יֶתֶר
הַפְּלֵטָה הַנִּשְׁאֶרֶת לָכֶם מִן־הַבָּרָד וְאָכַל אֶת־כָּל־הָעֵץ הַצֹּמֵחַ
לָכֶם מִן־הַשָּׂדֶה׃ 6 וּמָלְאוּ בָתֶּיךָ וּבָתֵּי כָל־עֲבָדֶיךָ וּבָתֵּי כָל־מִצְרַיִם
אֲשֶׁר לֹא־רָאוּ אֲבֹתֶיךָ וַאֲבוֹת אֲבֹתֶיךָ מִיּוֹם הֱיוֹתָם עַל־הָאֲדָמָה
עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וַיִּפֶן וַיֵּצֵא מֵעִם פַּרְעֹה׃ 7 וַיֹּאמְרוּ עַבְדֵי פַרְעֹה
אֵלָיו עַד־מָתַי יִהְיֶה זֶה לָנוּ לְמוֹקֵשׁ שַׁלַּח אֶת־הָאֲנָשִׁים וְיַעַבְדוּ
אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם הֲטֶרֶם תֵּדַע כִּי אָבְדָה מִצְרָיִם׃ 8 וַיּוּשַׁב
אֶת־מֹשֶׁה וְאֶת־אַהֲרֹן אֶל־פַּרְעֹה וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם לְכוּ עִבְדוּ אֶת־

Hiphil), is contracted, especially in verbs primae gutturalis, in conformity with a usage very general in Hebrew, as בָּאָרֶץ, instead of בְּהָאָרֶץ.

5. *And they shall cover the face of the earth.* עין הארץ, originally, *the eye of the earth*, then, as it were, with a metonymical change of the subject into the object, or of the active into the passive, that part of the earth which *is seen*, that is, *the surface;* which expression is clearly explained in the succeeding words: *so that it will be impossible to see the earth.* Similarly explain the Septuagint, ὄψιν τῆς γῆς; Vulgate, superficiem terrae; Rashi, את מראה הארץ. But Onkelos renders עין שמשא דארעא, "the eye of the sun of the earth," or, "the eye of the earth, which is the sun," (so also Abarbanel, Arnheim, and others), which poetical metaphor would not accord with the simple prosaical style of our narrative. —ולא יכלו, "one will not be able," used impersonally.—*And they shall eat the residue*, etc. The words "every tree which groweth for you out of the field," have misled many interpreters to suppose a long interval between this plague and the preceding one of hail, which they assert, had so completely destroyed the vegetation, that the circle of another year was required to produce new herbs and trees to serve as a prey to the locusts. However, 1st. we have already observed that expressions like "*all* grass of the field" must not be urged too literally (ix. 25); 2nd. The wheat and the spelt had not been affected by the hail, because they were not yet sufficiently advanced; a few weeks sufficed to make them welcome food for the voracity of the locusts; 3rd. As the hail-storm took place in the beginning of March (see note on ix. 31,32), the fruit-trees were, to a great extent, still in a backward state, and might, soon afterwards, have put forth their blossoms; 4th. The whole picture which the sacred text draws of the ten plagues, shows distinctly, that they occurred all in rapid succession, at the most in the course of one year (see note on vii. 20, 21).

6. *And he* (Moses) *turned and went out* with his brother Aaron (ver. 3).

7. זה, that is, Moses (דין גברא, Jonathan), not this affair, or, thy refusal (Septuagint, Vulgate, and others), which would require זאת, as, in Hebrew, the *feminines* of the pronouns are used with reference to *things*; compare verse 11; כי אתה אתם מבקשים.—מוקש (from

and Aaron came to Pharaoh, and said to him, Thus saith the Lord God of the Hebrews, How long wilt thou refuse to humble thyself before me? Let my people go, that they may serve me. 4. [1]For, if thou refuse to let my people go, behold, to-morrow shall I bring the locusts in thy [2]boundaries: 5. And they shall cover the face of the earth, so that it will be impossible to see the earth; and they shall eat the residue of that which is escaped, which is left to you from the hail, and shall eat every tree which groweth for you out of the field. 6. And they shall fill thy houses, and the houses of thy servants, and the houses of all the Egyptians; which neither thy fathers have seen, since the day that they were [3]in the land to this day. And he turned, and went out from Pharaoh. 7. And Pharaoh's servants said to him, How long shall this man be a snare to us? Let the men go, that they may serve the Lord their God: dost thou not yet know that Egypt is ruined? 8. And Moses and Aaron were brought back to Pharaoh: and he said to them, Go, serve the Lord your

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Else, if. [2] Coast. [3] Upon the earth.

יקש, to lay snares), a snare, or, metaphorically, a cause of misery and evil; the Septuagint and Vulgate render freely, a disgrace or scandal (*σκῶλον*, scandalum).—טרם, not yet, like ix. 30, and we need, therefore, not to supply, with Ebn Ezra, "dost thou rather wish to be informed of the ruin of Egypt?" (and similarly Luther); nor can we approve of the indistinct rendering of the Septuagint: *μὴ εἰδέναι βούλει, ὅτι ἀπόλωλεν Αἴγυπτος*;—the servants of Pharaoh, that is, his magicians, were now convinced, if not of the disposing Providence, at least of the unlimited might, of the God of Israel; and this confession is the first great triumph of truth in this grand and majestic combat between the light of religion and the darkness of superstition: and even Pharaoh yields to a certain degree.

8. *And Moses and Aaron were brought back* (ויושב) *to Pharaoh.* Transitive verbs in the third person singular of the passive (יוּשַׁב) govern sometimes the accusative (את משה ואת אהרן), because this form is, in its meaning, equivalent to the third person plural of the active; compare Numb. xxxii. 5, יֻתַּן את הארץ הזאת, "let this land be given." The opinion of Ebn Ezra and others, that את משה ואת אהרן are nominatives, and that the singular ויושב, refers more particularly to Moses, is less acceptable, although את has sometimes the meaning of a demonstrative pronoun, and the singular of the verb can be used *before* more than one substantive.—*Who are they that will go?* Every one feels that the repetition of the interrogative pronoun מי ומי implies an emphasis on the part of Pharaoh, who is anxious to know, distinctly and clearly, what the real wishes and intentions of Moses are.

9. The detailed enumeration of all classes of the people, and of their property, and the repetition of נלך, bears the character of manly and determined firmness: "we must go all, with our cattle,"

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם מִי וָמִי הַהֹלְכִים׃ 9 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה בִּנְעָרֵינוּ וּבִזְקֵנֵינוּ
נֵלֵךְ בְּבָנֵינוּ וּבִבְנוֹתֵנוּ בְּצֹאנֵנוּ וּבִבְקָרֵנוּ נֵלֵךְ כִּי חַג־יְהוָה לָנוּ׃
10 וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם יְהִי כֵן יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם כַּאֲשֶׁר אֲשַׁלַּח אֶתְכֶם וְאֶת־
טַפְּכֶם רְאוּ כִּי רָעָה נֶגֶד פְּנֵיכֶם׃ 11 לֹא כֵן לְכוּ־נָא הַגְּבָרִים
וְעִבְדוּ אֶת־יְהוָה כִּי אֹתָהּ אַתֶּם מְבַקְשִׁים וַיְגָרֶשׁ אֹתָם מֵאֵת פְּנֵי
פַרְעֹה׃ ס שני 12 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה
אֶל־מֹשֶׁה נְטֵה יָדְךָ עַל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם בָּאַרְבֶּה וְיַעַל עַל־אֶרֶץ
מִצְרָיִם וְיֹאכַל אֶת־כָּל־עֵשֶׂב הָאָרֶץ אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר הִשְׁאִיר הַבָּרָד׃
13 וַיֵּט מֹשֶׁה אֶת־מַטֵּהוּ עַל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וַיהוָה נִהַג רוּחַ־קָדִים

for we have a feast to the Lord (מקרא קדש, a general holy assembly, πανήγυρις). This request cannot have been unexpected to Pharaoh, as we know that the Egyptians celebrated frequently such general festivals in the wilderness (see note on v. i; compare Herodotus, ii. 58; and note on xii. 16).

10, 11. Pharaoh, however, is so irritated by this demand, that his malevolent mind spontaneously discloses itself; he declares, undisguisedly, what wishes he harbours for the fate of the Israelites, and expels Moses and Aaron from his palace; "for," said he "*see that you have evil plans before you*," that is, now it is clearly evident that you have treacherous intentions. This sense has already been expressed by the Septuagint (Ἴδητε ὅτι πονηρία πρόςκειται ὑμῖν), the Vulgate (cui dubium est, quod pessime cogitetis?), and Luther and most of the modern expositors have adopted this interpretation. But Onkelos renders thus: "Behold, the evil which you intend to do, will turn back upon your face;" and Ebn Ezra: "the evil, that is, your destruction, is near to you, and before your eyes," which is less adapted to the context (so also Brown: "you are hastening to your ruin"). About the interpretation of the Midrash, see Rashi on this verse. Cahen explains: "La malice est en face de vous, est évidente," which would rather require נגד פנינו, than נגד פניכם. Salomon: "dass ihr Böses im Sinne führt, das sieht man euch an den Augen an," but Pharaoh inferred it not from their *looks*, but their *words*. Vater translates: "May the Lord be so with you as I shall let you go; but as to your children, see, you intend evil." But besides the strange separation of אתכם and טפכם, the first part of the sentence would contain a blessing little in harmony with the violent expulsion of Moses and Aaron immediately following.—Pharaoh urges the word עבדו, *serve*, which Moses had always used in requesting the departure of the Israelites (vii. 16, 26; viii. 16, 23; ix. 1, 13), and which appears to include the *men* only. He is, therefore, inclined to allow the latter to go, "for that only have you desired," forgetting that Moses had just reminded him that it is a festival (חג) which they intended to celebrate to the Lord, and which required the presence of *all* members of the community (Deut. xvi. 10, 11, etc. "thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy man-servant, and thy maid-servant, and the Levite, and the stranger, and the orphan, and the widow, *all* who are in thy gates"). Ebn Ezra refers אתה to רעה, in the preceding verse, explaining very forcedly: "for that evil design you have always entertained."—ויגרש אתם, *impersonaliter*,

God: *but* who *are* they that will go? 9. And Moses said, With our young and with our old will we go, with our sons and with our daughters, with our flocks and with our herds will we go; for we have a feast to the Lord. 10. And he said to them, So may the Lord be with you as I shall let you go and your children: [1]see, that you have evil *plans* before you. 11. Not so: go now, you men, and serve the Lord; for that have you desired. And they were driven from the presence of Pharaoh.

12. And the Lord said to Moses, Stretch out thy hand over the land of Egypt for the locusts, that they may come upon the land of Egypt, and eat every herb of the land, every *thing* which the hail hath left. 13. And Moses stretched forth his staff over the land of Egypt,

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Look to it, for evil is before you.

and they were driven (German, "Man trieb sie"), compare verse 5: יוכל.

12. Stretch out thy hand over the land of Egypt, *for the locusts* בארבה; for ב has occasionally this signification, *on account of*, or, *for*; for instance, Gen. xxix. 20, ויעבד יעקב ברחל שבע שנים, "And Jacob served *for* Rachel seven years." The Septuagint paraphrases: Ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου . . . . . καὶ ἀναβήτω ἀκρὶς ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

13. *The Lord brought an east-wind* (רוח קדים) *upon the land . . . . . and the east-wind brought the locusts.* It has frequently been asserted, that an east-wind could not have brought the locusts into Egypt: 1st. Because these insects always wander in a straight direction from south to north; and 2nd. Because they cannot well fly over the water, and they would, therefore, have perished in the Red Sea before reaching Egypt. But as to the first objection, we remark, that although the swarms of locusts *frequently* move from south to north, so that if they come from Arabia Petræa they generally take their way through Palestine, Syria, Karamania, Natolia, etc.: they do not exclusively go in that direction, but are, in this respect, perfectly dependent on the wind which happens to blow. It has been sufficiently proved, that the locusts *come with every wind* (see *Credner*, on Joel, p. 286). In Arabia, it is generally taken as granted, that the locusts always come from the east, and the Arabians say, therefore, that they are bred by the water of the Persian Gulf (*Burkhardt*, Notes on the Bedouins and Wahabys, p. 268). The second objection is as little founded, since authentic travellers have reported that the locusts do not only fly over narrow parts of the sea, as the straits of Gibraltar, or the Red Sea, but even over great distances, as the Mediterranean, if they are borne by a gentle wind (see *Credner*, p. 288; *Niebuhr*, Descr. p. 169); and a Syrian writer observes: "In the year 1463, very many locusts came from the East, they reached Egypt, where they devoured all herbs, etc." It is, therefore, neither necessary to translate רוח קדים *south wind* (with the Septuagint, ἄνεμον νότον; Vulgate, "ventus urens"; *Samum*—Bochart, Rosenmüller, and others), nor to *understand* it, with Philippson, as that wind, and to suppose: "that we have here an inaccuracy of the language, קדים being used instead of תימן." The reason adduced by Bochart, that locusts are more numerous in Ethiopia than in Arabia, and that given by Rosenmüller,

בָּאָרֶץ כָּל־הַיּוֹם הַהוּא וְכָל־הַלָּיְלָה הַבֹּקֶר הָיָה וְרוּחַ הַקָּדִים נָשָׂא
אֶת־הָאַרְבֶּה׃ 14 וַיַּעַל הָאַרְבֶּה עַל כָּל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וַיָּנַח בְּכֹל
גְּבוּל מִצְרָיִם כָּבֵד מְאֹד לְפָנָיו לֹא־הָיָה כֵן אַרְבֶּה כָּמֹהוּ וְאַחֲרָיו
לֹא יִהְיֶה־כֵּן׃ 15 וַיְכַס אֶת־עֵין כָּל־הָאָרֶץ וַתֶּחְשַׁךְ הָאָרֶץ וַיֹּאכַל
אֶת־כָּל־עֵשֶׂב הָאָרֶץ וְאֵת כָּל־פְּרִי הָעֵץ אֲשֶׁר הוֹתִיר הַבָּרָד וְלֹא־
נוֹתַר כָּל־יֶרֶק בָּעֵץ וּבְעֵשֶׂב הַשָּׂדֶה בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃
16 וַיְמַהֵר פַּרְעֹה לִקְרֹא לְמֹשֶׁה וּלְאַהֲרֹן וַיֹּאמֶר חָטָאתִי לַיהוָה
אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְלָכֶם׃ 17 וְעַתָּה שָׂא נָא חַטָּאתִי אַךְ הַפַּעַם וְהַעְתִּירוּ
לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְיָסֵר מֵעָלַי רַק אֶת־הַמָּוֶת הַזֶּה׃ 18 וַיֵּצֵא מֵעִם
פַּרְעֹה וַיֶּעְתַּר אֶל־יְהוָה׃ 19 וַיַּהֲפֹךְ יְהוָה רוּחַ־יָם חָזָק מְאֹד וַיִּשָּׂא
אֶת־הָאַרְבֶּה וַיִּתְקָעֵהוּ יַמָּה סּוּף לֹא נִשְׁאַר אַרְבֶּה אֶחָד בְּכֹל

that the verb עלה (ver. 14), is generally used with regard to movements from the south to the north (see on i. 10), are of little weight, for it is universally known that the locusts which come from Arabia, are, by their enormous quantities, a real plague; and the expression "the locusts went up over all the land of Egypt," signifies only their appearing in large numbers over the whole country (see viii. 1, 2).

14. *Before then there were no such locusts as they, neither after them shall be such*, which appeared to many contradictory with the passage in Joel (ii. 2), where it is similarly said, that there has never been, nor will there ever be a plague of locusts like that. If we really will pedantically weigh the syllables of a poetical phrase, the seeming discrepancy might in the easiest manner be reconciled by the remark, that here the expression refers to Egypt, and in Joel to Palestine (Kimchi, Ebn Ezra, Rashi, and others, believe that here the quantity, and in Joel the number of the different species is unparalleled. See, however, Ps. lxxviii. 46, and cv. 34). About similar and almost proverbial hyperbolical phrases compare 2 Kings xviii. 5, and xxiii. 25. Hasselquist (Tr. p. 254), observes: "that Egypt is never visited by the locusts;" and others infer from it, that "the strangeness of the occurrence, contrary to the well-known habits of the creatures, betokened the interposition of Almighty power in bringing that plague upon the land" (*Jamieson*). But that assertion is not correct. For Niebuhr (Descript. of Arabia, p. 168), states, that during his stay in Kairo, the first great swarm of locusts arrived there towards the end of December, in the year 1761, and a still more formidable one on the 9th of January, of the following year. They came with a south-west wind, and, therefore, probably, from the Lybian desert. Then, not the occurrence itself, but its extraordinary character formed the miracle.

15. About the faithfulness of this description, and the vast desolations caused by the locusts, see on ver. 1.

16, 17. Pharaoh is again compelled to bend his pride, to acknowledge his sin, and to request the interference of Moses before God for the removal of the plague (מות death or *pestis*—pestilence, as Plin. Hist. Nat. xi. 29, calls the locusts, on account of the fearful consequence of pestilence, with which that plague is attended).—שא נא חטאתי *forgive, I pray*

and the Lord brought an east wind upon the land all that day, and all *that* night; *and* when it was morning, the east-wind brought the locusts. 14. And the locusts came over all the land of Egypt, and rested in all the boundaries of Egypt, a very heavy *plague;* before them there were no such locusts as they, neither after them shall be such. 15. For they covered the surface of the whole land, so that the land was darkened; and they did eat every herb of the land, and all the fruit of the trees which the hail had left; and there remained not any *thing* green in the trees, or in the herbs of the field, through all the land of Egypt. 16. Then Pharaoh hastened to call for Moses and Aaron, and he said, I have sinned against the Lord your God, and against you. 17. Now, therefore, forgive, I pray thee, my sin only this once, and entreat the Lord your God, that He may remove from me this death only. 18. And he went out from Pharaoh and entreated the Lord. 19. And the Lord turned a very strong west-wind, which bore away the locusts, and cast

thee, my sin, properly, take away my sin, i.e. make it disappear, or take no regard of it, *pardon it.*

19. *And the Lord turned* (ויהפך) *a very strong west-wind* (רוח ים); which expression clearly shows, that the locusts had come into Egypt by the opposite east-wind (ver. 13). רוח ים is the wind which blows from the Mediterranean Sea over Palestine, i.e. the west wind. Rosenmüller, Clericus, and others, who take רוח קדים in ver. 13, as south wind, are naturally obliged to understand here רוח ים as the north or north-west wind. The "wind of the sea," would, with respect to Egypt, certainly be the north wind, but רוח ים without further addition, is the usual designation of the west wind, according to the geographical position of Palestine. Although the locusts are borne by a *gentle* wind over long tracks of the sea (see ver. 13), they invariably become the victims of a heavy gale, which makes them almost instantaneously sink into the waves, whence they are driven to the coasts, infesting the air with pestilence.—*And cast them* ויתקעהו from תקע originally *to fix*, Onk. ורמהי Sept. ἔβαλεν. The Arabian gulf is called ים סוף—that is, the Sea of Weeds, or Bulrushes (*Sari*, Alga Nilotica, see note on ii. 3), because it is said to abound in these plants (*Strabo*, xvi. p. 773, Cas.). We may, however, add, that Bruce, an accurate and veracious reporter of his eastern travels, maintains, that he noticed no weed of any kind in the ים סוף, and that such plants cannot be expected in a narrow gulph, under the immediate influence of the monsoons, blowing from contrary points six months each year, and causing too much agitation to produce such vegetables, seldom found but in stagnant water, and still more seldom, if ever, growing in sweet ones. His opinion is, therefore, that it is from the large trees or plants, of *white coral*, perfectly in imitation of plants on land, that the sea has taken its name. But if his observations in this respect are correct, we must sup-

גְּבוּל מִצְרָיִם׃ 20 וַיְחַזֵּק יְהוָה אֶת־לֵב פַּרְעֹה וְלֹא שִׁלַּח אֶת־בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל׃
21 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה נְטֵה יָדְךָ עַל־הַשָּׁמַיִם וִיהִי חֹשֶׁךְ עַל־
אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם וְיָמֵשׁ חֹשֶׁךְ׃ 22 וַיֵּט מֹשֶׁה אֶת־יָדוֹ עַל־הַשָּׁמָיִם
וַיְהִי חֹשֶׁךְ־אֲפֵלָה בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים׃ 23 לֹא־רָאוּ
אִישׁ אֶת־אָחִיו וְלֹא־קָמוּ אִישׁ מִתַּחְתָּיו שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים וּלְכָל־בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל הָיָה אוֹר בְּמוֹשְׁבֹתָם׃ שלישי 24 וַיִּקְרָא פַרְעֹה

pose that the gulf of Suez, which has in the course of time undergone considerable changes, has suffered similar modifications with regard to its vegetable productions; for the name "Sea of Bulrushes," and the identity of סוף are too unquestionable, to admit of any uncertainty (see note on xiii. 20).

Ninth Plague. Darkness (חשך). Ver. 21—29.

21. Before the final and most fearful judgment, God strikes the Egyptians with a plague intended to awe their senses and to impress their minds with the majestic grandeur of the Almighty, rather than to operate fatally or destructively; it is, indeed, a worthy preparation for the mighty strokes which were soon to fall upon the unhappy country. The Egyptians worshipped Osiris as the god of the sun or of day; a palpable darkness obscured his rays; he was unable to dispel it; and he was thus proved to be powerless compared with the God of Israel. Even darkness was holy to them; but it came now in such unnatural and unexpected form, that the object of their worship became to them an object of horror. But this plague also had a natural basis; and its miraculous character is to be sought in the unusual extent of the phenomenon and the exemption of the Israelites from its effects (ver. 23). About the beginning of April — the time of our wonder — the fearful hot wind, known under the name of Samum or Chamsin, commences to blow in Egypt and Arabia, and is always attended with a thickness of the air, which allows the sun only to throw a dim, yellow light upon the earth, and which not unfrequently causes even complete, dreary darkness, filling the inhabitants with dismay and consternation. On such occasions the people in the towns and villages shut themselves up in their houses, in the undermost rooms or vaults; the tenants of the deserts hide themselves in caverns or pits, which they dig in the earth. There they await, with anxious suspense, the end of this dangerous tempest, which generally lasts *three days* (see ver. 22). The streets are, during this time, perfectly empty, and a deep silence reigns everywhere as during the night. Du Bois Aymé (Déscript. de l'Egypte viii. p. 110), writes: "When the Chamsin blows, the sun has a pale yellow colour; his light is veiled, and darkness reaches sometimes such a degree, that it appears to be the most gloomy night; as we experienced it about the middle of the day at Kene, a city of the Saïd." We possess further accounts of complete darkness in Egypt: Thus writes Dschemaleddin in his Chronicle: "Under the reign of Mostali-Billah, king of Egypt (about the end of the 11th century), a great and violent storm, accompanied by black darkness, arose; houses were overthrown and trees uprooted; but the darkness was so intense, that everybody thought that the end of the world was approaching." Thus we see that darkness comes generally as a concomitant of tempests, especially the Samum; and from this reason, no doubt, the Sept. Version, whose authors were so

them into the Red Sea; there remained not one locust in all the boundaries of Egypt. 20. But the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart, so that he would not let the children of Israel go.

21. And the Lord said to Moses, Stretch out thy hand towards heaven, that there may be darkness over the land of Egypt, [1]so that they may grope in darkness. 22. And Moses stretched forth his hand towards heaven, and there was a thick darkness in all the land of Egypt three days. 23. They saw not one another, neither rose any man from his place for three days: but all the children of Israel had light in their dwellings. 24. And Pharaoh

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Even darkness which may be felt.

well acquainted with the phenomena of Egypt, inserts *θύελλα*, whirlwind, after "thick darkness," in ver. 22 (comp. about that remarkable wind, *Sonnini*, iii. 35; *Denon*, i. p. 285; *Michaud*, vii. 11; *Cicero* also, de Nat. Deor. ii. 96, relates that an eruption of the Ætna was followed by such a darkness, that, "for two days no man could recognise any other person").—וימש חשך. These words are to be translated: "and they shall grope in darkness," quite analogous to Job v. 14, יומם ימששו חשך "in the day they grope in darkness." Targum Jerusal.: ויהון ממשמשין בחשוכא. Here, as in many other passages, בְּ is omitted. ימש is the Hiph. of משש, which root is not rare in Piel; Deut. xxviii. 29; Job xii. 25; where we read almost the same phrase, ימששו חשך "they grope in darkness." Various are the interpretations offered on these words. Targum Onkel. renders freely: "after the darkness of night has receded;" i.e. after the darkness of night another obscuration more dense and gloomy will ensue. He thus derives וימש from מוש to recede, to depart, as in xiii. 22; and similarly these words are taken by Saadiah. But this would at least require חשך הלילה, as Rosenmüller justly observes. Rashi understands וימש like וְיַאֲמֵשׁ: "and the darkness of the night of yesterday (אֶמֶשׁ) will remain," and thus, also, Rashbam, the Syrian Version, Mendelssohn ("und die Finsterness soll anhalten"), Zunz and Arnheim (who explains: וימש חשך is identical with ויהי חשך של אמש=חשך אפילה nächtliche Finsterniss). But we have no other instance of this contraction of יָמֵשׁ instead of יַאֲמֵשׁ; it is even doubtful whether אמש is ever used as a verb. Ebn Ezra and others derive it correctly from משש, but explain: "the darkness will be so thick that it will be felt or palpable." Thus the Sept. *ψηλαφητὸν σκότος*, palpable darkness, and the Vulgate: "tenebræ tam densae ut palpari queant." So also Luther, English Version, Rosenmüller, Salomon, Lengerke, and others. But a darkness which can be felt with the hand, like a solid matter, would be a hyperbolical expression, even too bold for the glowing Oriental phraseology.

22. Compare the poetical description of this plague in Sap. Sal. xvii. 1—6. חשך אפלה, two synonymous substantives combined, in order to enhance the notion: dense, extreme darkness. Rashbam חשך גדול.

23. *Neither rose any man from his place*, i.e. from his house; but Septuagint, *ἐκ τῆς κοίτης αὐτοῦ*; e cubili suo, from his bed; which is improbable. Compare xvi. 29.

24. יֻצָּג *let be stayed*, Hophal of יָצַג to place, put, or leave (conjugated like a verb פ"נ). Rashi correctly יהי מוצג

אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וַיֹּאמֶר לְכוּ עִבְדוּ אֶת־יְהֹוָה רַק צֹאנְכֶם וּבְקַרְכֶם יֻצָּג
גַּם־טַפְּכֶם יֵלֵךְ עִמָּכֶם׃ 25 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה גַּם־אַתָּה תִּתֵּן בְּיָדֵנוּ
זְבָחִים וְעֹלֹת וְעָשִׂינוּ לַיהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ׃ 26 וְגַם־מִקְנֵנוּ יֵלֵךְ עִמָּנוּ
לֹא תִשָּׁאֵר פַּרְסָה כִּי מִמֶּנּוּ נִקַּח לַעֲבֹד אֶת־יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ וַאֲנַחְנוּ
לֹא־נֵדַע מַה־נַּעֲבֹד אֶת־יְהֹוָה עַד־בֹּאֵנוּ שָׁמָּה׃ 27 וַיְחַזֵּק יְהֹוָה
אֶת־לֵב פַּרְעֹה וְלֹא אָבָה לְשַׁלְּחָם׃ 28 וַיֹּאמֶר־לוֹ פַרְעֹה לֵךְ
מֵעָלָי הִשָּׁמֶר לְךָ אַל־תֹּסֶף רְאוֹת פָּנַי כִּי בְּיוֹם רְאֹתְךָ פָנַי תָּמוּת׃
29 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה כֵּן דִּבַּרְתָּ לֹא־אֹסִף עוֹד רְאוֹת פָּנֶיךָ׃ פ

במקומו. Onkelos (שבוקו) and Septuagint (*ὑπολείπεσθε*) translate יֻצָּג as an active verb.—Your flocks and herds shall remain here as a pledge of your return. For the king naturally suspected the sincerity of Moses' demand; believing, that not merely an absence of three days, for the purpose of sacrificing, but a departure from Egypt for ever was intended. And, therefore, when by the answer of Moses (ver. 26), this conjecture was strengthened in his mind to a certainty, he was resolved rather to suffer the utmost perdition than to yield to a request which he thought was insidiously made to him, and which, if granted, would deprive him of so many thousands of vigorous and useful workmen. We can, therefore, not see with Clarke any particular cruelty on the part of Pharaoh in making the demand, that the cattle should be left behind; for there was, we think, little danger that "the Israelites would, without their flocks, perish from hunger in three days."

25, 26. The sense of these verses is clearly this: it is not sufficient to permit us to go into the desert to celebrate there a festival to our God, but thou must allow us to take with us our cattle to offer to Him sacrifices; and, as we do not know what animals it is right to use for this sacred purpose—this being our first common festival of this kind—we must take *all* our cattle with us; for in the desert

יא 1 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהֹוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה עוֹד נֶגַע אֶחָד אָבִיא עַל־פַּרְעֹה

1. The close connection between this and the preceding chapter is this: After Pharaoh had threatened Moses with death, if he ventured to appear again before him (x. 28); Moses, already informed by the Lord of the final events now so nearly impending, answered him, that he would willingly obey his commands (ver. 29); but, previous to his departing, he announced to the king the last and most formidable calamity, death of all the first-born of Egypt, and communicated to him the other circumstances—the cries of the Egyptians, the glory of the Hebrews, the wonders of the exodus—with which that event would be accompanied (xi. 4—8). But, in order to acquaint the reader that such revelations had been made by God to Moses, this communication is here parenthetically inserted (ver. 1), and the command concerning the vessels of gold and silver, which God had repeated to Moses simultaneously with that revelation, is naturally added (ver. 2, 3), although it has no immediate bearing upon the subsequent verses. Thus we think the context is clear and coherent, and we require therefore none of the artificial and dissecting conjectures of modern writers, who suppose either

called for Moses, and said, Go you, serve the Lord; only let your flocks and your herds be stayed: let your children also go with you. 25. And Moses said, Thou must give into our hands also sacrifices and burnt-offerings, that we may sacrifice to the Lord our God. 26. Our cattle also shall go with us; there shall not one hoof remain behind; for thereof must we take to serve the Lord our God; and we know not *with* what we must serve the Lord until we come thither. 27. But the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart, and he would not let them go. 28. And Pharaoh said to him, Go away from me, take heed to thyself, see my face no more; for in *that* day thou seest my face thou shalt die. 29. And Moses said, Thou hast spoken right, I will see thy face again no more.

only God will teach us the precepts concerning sacrifices.—Ebn Ezra, Rashi, and others, explain artificially: "thou Pharaoh also must give us animals to sacrifice in thy name." The particle גם, in ver 25, belongs, therefore, to זבחים וכ׳, not to אתה (comp. ver. 26 וגם מקננו). About עלת and זבחים see note on xviii. 12.—*That we may sacrifice* (ועשינו) *to the Lord our God.* עשה in this sense of sacrificing, occurs also in Exod. xxix. 36; 2 Kings xvii. 32, etc. (= in Greek ἱερὰ ῥέζειν. Il. ii. 400; viii. 250; Od. xiv. 151).—*There shall not a hoof remain behind;* a powerful expression signifying *nothing at all, no particle* of a thing.

29. *Thou hast spoken right;* כֵּן is used in this signification in Num. xxxvi. 5 (כן מטה בני יוסף דברים). Compare Numb. xxvii. 7; Eccles. viii. 10; and Onk. יאות מלילתא—*I will see thy face again no more,* says Moses to Pharaoh; but before he leaves the palace, he announces to Pharaoh the last plague (xi. 4, *et seq.*), and leaves him then only in anger (ver. 8), returning but once more by the request of the king himself (xii. 31).

CHAP. XI. 1. And the Lord [1]had said to Moses, One plague more will I bring upon Pharaoh and upon Egypt;

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Said.

that vers. 1—3 and even x. 21—29 are inappropriate fragments which interrupt the connection (so Vater, Schott, De Wette, Maurer), or that x. 28, 29, are to be placed behind xi. 8 (Houbigant, Townsend), or xii. 1—20 after x. 20 (Townsend), or that the reading of the Samaritan Version of ver. 3 is correct, which has this alteration: ונתתי את חן העם הזה בעיני מצרים והשאילום, so that vers. 1—8 are the announcement of Moses before Pharaoh (as Geddes believes). The interpolations of the Samaritan codex are here the more suspicious, just because they affect a greater simplicity and clearness; and the remark of Clarke, that "some passages might have been omitted because an ancient copyist found the substance of them in other places," is scarcely reconcilable with the anxious scrupulousness with which that commentator usually adheres to the sacred text. He scarcely allows a metaphor; he takes תבלעמו ארץ xv. 12, literally as an earthquake; the words אמר אויב ver. 9, are to him a proof that Pharaoh really uttered the

וְעַל־מִצְרַיִם אַחֲרֵי־כֵן יְשַׁלַּח אֶתְכֶם מִזֶּה כְּשַׁלְּחוֹ כָּלָה גָּרֵשׁ יְגָרֵשׁ
אֶתְכֶם מִזֶּה׃ 2 דַּבֶּר־נָא בְּאָזְנֵי הָעָם וְיִשְׁאֲלוּ אִישׁ ׀ מֵאֵת רֵעֵהוּ
וְאִשָּׁה מֵאֵת רְעוּתָהּ כְּלֵי־כֶסֶף וּכְלֵי זָהָב׃ 3 וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה אֶת־חֵן
הָעָם בְּעֵינֵי מִצְרָיִם גַּם ׀ הָאִישׁ מֹשֶׁה גָּדוֹל מְאֹד בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם
בְּעֵינֵי עַבְדֵי־פַרְעֹה וּבְעֵינֵי הָעָם׃ ס רביעי 4 וַיֹּאמֶר
מֹשֶׁה כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה כַּחֲצֹת הַלַּיְלָה אֲנִי יוֹצֵא בְּתוֹךְ מִצְרָיִם׃
5 וּמֵת כָּל־בְּכוֹר בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִבְּכוֹר פַּרְעֹה הַיֹּשֵׁב עַל־כִּסְאוֹ

following sentences, etc. Comp. about the differences of the Hebrew and Samaritan text: *Kennicott's* Remarks on select passages in the Old Testament. Oxford 1787. *Ranke*, Untersuchungen ii. p. 24—28. We take, therefore, ויאמר with Ebn Ezra (כבר אמר) as pluperfect: *and God had said to Moses.* Others (Rashbam, etc.) explain: God spoke to Moses whilst he stood before Pharaoh; for the revelation came suddenly upon him. But this is at least unnecessary.—כשלחו כלה גרש יגרש אתכם מזה. *When he will let you go, he will surely drive you away hence altogether*, כשלחו וגו׳ which words can either signify (if we connect כלה with אתכם): Pharaoh will let you go with *all your property*, which he had hitherto so determinedly refused to allow (x. 24; compare xii. 32; so Kimchi; Sept. σὺν παντὶ ἐκβαλεῖ ὑμᾶς), or (if we take כלה to גרש): he will certainly drive you entirely and in haste out of the land, so that he will with the same impetuosity wish you to depart for ever, as he now pertinaciously strives to retain you (see vi. 1; so Ebn Ezra). The latter interpretation seems more plausible. כלה is used as an adverb *entirely*, as in Gen. xviii. 21.

2. *Speak now* (נא) *in the ears of the people.* נא implies here no entreaty (*Rashi*), but signifies *now* (עתה, *Ebn Ezra*); thus Onkelos, כען; Septuagint, οὖν (but adds κρυφῇ secretly, which is not in the Hebrew text). About this command see note on iii. 22.

3. *And the Lord gave* (ויתן) *the people favour in the eyes of the Egyptians.* The alteration of the Samaritan Version (ונתתי וגו׳, and I shall give, etc., see ver. 1) bears too obviously the character of a facilitating emendation to be genuine, and must therefore be rejected. Our verse partly contains the reason, why the departing Hebrews would receive rich presents from their old neighbours, and partly alludes to the result with which the command of God would be attended at the time of the Exodus (xii. 36).—The reason is twofold: 1. The Egyptians were favourably inclined towards the Hebrews (see on iii. 21), no doubt because the latter had proved faithful and obliging neighbours, and because their unequalled sufferings inspired even the hearts of the idolators with sympathy and compassion; and 2. The authority of Moses was paramount throughout all Egypt; because it was evident that he was the messenger and prophet of a God by far more powerful than any of the Egyptian deities, and because no doubt his modesty and unassuming conduct in the midst of the stupendous miracles he wrought, filled the Egyptians with admiration for the rare qualities of his character. With historical faithfulness and unaffected simplicity Moses makes these remarks about his own person; they are historical facts; and he relates them with the same objective impartiality, with which, for instance, Xenophon speaks of himself in the Anabasis, or Caesar in his Commentaries. Besides, these words are merely added to give an additional reason for the willingness with which the Egyp-

afterwards he will let you go hence: when he will let you go, he will surely drive you away hence altogether. 2. Speak now in the ears of the people, and let every man [1]ask of his neighbour, and every woman of her neighbour, [2]articles of silver, and articles of gold. 3. And the Lord gave the people favour in the eyes of the Egyptians. Moreover, the man Moses *was* very great in the land of Egypt, in the eyes of Pharaoh's servants, and in the eyes of the people. 4. And Moses said, Thus saith the Lord, About midnight shall I go into the midst of Egypt. 5. And all the firstborn in the land of Egypt shall die, from the firstborn of Pharaoh who

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Borrow. [2] Jewels.

tians loaded the departing Israelites with presents. These reasons were, then, fourfold: 1. The Egyptians' fear of further plagues; 2. The interference of God, who inclined their hearts towards the strangers; 3. The friendship which had long existed between the Egyptian people and the Hebrews; and 4. The extraordinary power which Moses had displayed, and which they felt assured, could only be imparted by preternatural influence. See note on iii. 21, 22. See Num. xii. 7, 8. About Num. xii. 3, where Moses calls himself "the meekest of all men upon the face of the earth;" see the remarks of *Hengstenberg*, Authentic. of the Pentateuch ii. p. 173—178.—These facts are not unimportant for the true historical estimation of the oppressions which the Hebrews suffered in Egypt, as they evidently show, that the cruelty of the Egyptian *king*, not the aversion of the *nation*, enacted the tyrannical measures against them; and that at least a large portion of the Egyptians became now impressed with the surpassing grandeur of the God of Israel. They enriched them, therefore, with presents, not merely from motives of fear, or a selfish desire to be freed of their ominous presence, but because they began to be imbued with a deep feeling of respect and awe for a nation so evidently favoured by an omnipotent and all-governing God.

4. *About midnight* (כחצת) *shall I go into the midst of Egypt.* כַּחֲצֹת (Infinitive of חצה to divide, used as a substantive) is identical with בחצי, xii. 29, which does not exactly signify the precise minute of midnight. See Ruth iii. 8; Psalm cxix. 62. The Talmudical opinion to the contrary is refuted by Ebn Ezra.—ועברתי=אני יוצא in xii. 12. Onkelos, apparently to avoid this anthropomorphical expression renders in both passages אנא מתגלי, "I reveal myself." See, however, note on ii. 25.—Compare Amos, v. 17.

5. All the firstborn of Egypt shall die, from the son of the king, *who sits on the throne* (not who will once sit on the throne, as Onkelos, Jonathan, Ebn Ezra, and others translate), to the son of the meanest and most despised servant in the kingdom, or as it is worded here, *to the firstborn of the handmaid, who is behind the mill*, which is in xii. 29, expressed עד בכור השבי, *to the firstborn of the captive*; for the toilsome and degrading task of grinding corn on handmills was imposed upon the lowest persons, and especially on captives and slaves. This was, for instance, the fate of Samson after he had fallen into the hands of the Philistines (Judg. xvi. 21). Isaiah (xlvii. 1, 2) describes the conquered Babylon under the picture of a captive virgin, and says, among other similar traits, "take the millstones and grind flour." The handmills of the ancient Egyptians were most

עַד בְּכוֹר הַשִּׁפְחָה אֲשֶׁר אַחַר הָרֵחָיִם וְכֹל בְּכוֹר בְּהֵמָה׃
6 וְהָיְתָה צְעָקָה גְדֹלָה בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם אֲשֶׁר כָּמֹהוּ לֹא נִהְיָתָה
וְכָמֹהוּ לֹא תֹסִף׃ 7 וּלְכֹל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא יֶחֱרַץ־כֶּלֶב לְשֹׁנוֹ
לְמֵאִישׁ וְעַד־בְּהֵמָה לְמַעַן תֵּדְעוּן אֲשֶׁר יַפְלֶה יְהוָה בֵּין מִצְרַיִם
וּבֵין יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ 8 וְיָרְדוּ כָל־עֲבָדֶיךָ אֵלֶּה אֵלַי וְהִשְׁתַּחֲווּ־לִי לֵאמֹר

probably quite similar to those at present in use among their descendants and among the wandering Arabs. They were found in every house, and formed so indispensable a household-utensil, that the Hebrew lawgiver expressly interdicted to take them as a pledge for debts (Deut. xxiv. 6). The Bedouins carry them in all their wanderings with them. It seems to have been a universal custom in antiquity that only women worked them; for not only was this the case among the Egyptians and Arabs, but also among the Greeks (*Homer*, Od. vii. 104); and the women were, during this process, usually seated on the bare ground. Now those hand-mills are simply two circular flat stones, generally about eighteen inches in diameter, the lower one fixed, the upper turning loosely upon a wooden pivot, or shaft, rising from the centre of that beneath it, and moved quickly round by a wooden handle. The grain is poured through the hole of the pivot, and the flour is collected in a cloth spread under the mill. The ancient Egyptians had also larger mills, usually of granite, constructed on a similar principle, and probably turned by oxen or asses. The stone used for the hand-mills was hard grit, probably taken from the mountains of the Mokuttum, near Kairo. (See *Wilkinson*, Manners, ii. 118; *Layard*, Discoveries in Nineveh and Babylon, p. 287).—בכור השפחה אשר. The relative pronoun אשר evidently refers to שפחה, not to בכור; for this proverbial phrase indicates the meanness of *descent*, opposed to בכור פרעה.—In the whole Orient the firstborn son enjoyed, besides a greater personal authority, real and material privileges. After the father's death he received a double portion of the inheritance (Deut. xxi. 17), and was the guardian of his younger unmarried brothers and sisters; as the "firstling of the father's strength" (ראשית און, Genesis, xlix. 3), he was considered superior: and it was forbidden to transfer the right of primogeniture upon a younger son (Deut. xxi. 16). The death of the first-born caused, therefore, in every family the deepest grief; and with this unusual calamity all the houses of Egypt are now threatened.—Even the firstborn of beasts shall be killed to complete the misery of the Egyptians, and to make this plague the more manifestly a divine visitation, since it is well-known, that a very considerable number of animals were worshipped as gods, who were thus suddenly annihilated, together with a great portion of that nation, which had lavished unavailing honours upon their idle service.

6. We need scarcely remind the reader, that in the East the manifestations of grief and mourning at the loss of beloved relatives are of a far more violent character than in our countries; and there is sometimes an impetuosity in those lamentations which is attended with all conceivable forms of self-castigation: the men tear out the hair of the head and the beard; strew ashes upon their heads; throw themselves into the dust; tear their garments, and not seldom lacerate their faces and bodies; they fast; remove every ornament; they formerly hired even mourning women (מקוננות, Jer. ix. 16), who, like those of the Greeks and Romans, recited, during the days of mourning, in the houses and at the graves, loud and woeful dirges. If we add hereto the fact, that the Egyptians were especially inconsolable and

sitteth upon the throne, to the firstborn of the handmaid who *is* behind the mill; and all the firstborn of beasts. 6. And there shall be a great cry throughout all the land of Egypt, such as there was none like it, nor shall be like it any more. 7. But against any of the children of Israel shall not a dog sharpen his tongue, against man or beast; that you may know that the Lord distinguisheth between the Egyptians and between Israel. 8. And all these thy servants shall come down to me, and shall bow down

seized with deep consternation at the death of any of their sacred animals, many of which were struck by the pestilence (ver. 5); we shall scarcely find the expression of our text exaggerated, "that there shall be a great cry throughout all the land of Egypt, such as there was none like it, nor shall be like it any more." With reference to צעקה, which is feminine (גדלה and נהיתה), is said כמהו in the masculine, about which inaccuracy see note on i. 21. לא תסף *scil.* להיות.

7. *But against any of the children of Israel shall not a dog sharpen his tongue* (לא יחרץ כלב לשנו), *against man or beast*, that is, nobody, even not the meanest of their enemies shall attack or insult them; they will leave Egypt free and unmolested. חרץ (Arabic, حرص); to cut, to sharpen, and Rashi renders correctly, ישונן, and so most of the modern translators. The other ancient interpreters express rather the sense: "no dog will injure with his tongue, even so far as to bark" (*Onkelos*); "no dog will either bark or bite" (*Ebn Ezra*); "no dog will move his tongue" (*Kimchi*); Septuagint, γρύξει; Vulgate, mutiet; Luther, mucken. Michaelis explains most forcedly: "But to any of the children of Israel shall not a dog let his tongue hang out of his throat for pain or illness," bringing חרץ into connection with the Arabic حرض, so that the sense would be, "even not a dog of the Israelites will die," which interpretation, however, is irreconcilable with the words immediately following *from man to beast.* Not more acceptable is the exposition of Clarke, who takes our words partly literally, the house-dogs will not, according to their natural instinct, bark presaging the death of their masters by their cries; and partly mythologically, their sacred God *Anubis latrator* (son of Osiris) would not bark, but be silent, not indicating to them the flight of their enemies.—The same proverbial phrase occurs in Joshua x. 21. כל, with לא preceding or following it, signifies *not any* (ne-personne); for instance, Gen. iii. 1, לא תאכלו מכל עץ הגן, "you shall not eat of any fruit of the garden." But if כל alone would have signified *whole*, the negative לא has no influence upon its meaning; for instance, כלו לא תראה, "the whole (people) thou shalt not see."—למאיש, see ix. 18.—יפלה, as in viii. 18, distinguishes, makes a difference; Onkelos, justly, יפריש; Rashi, יבדיל; Septuagint renders παραδοξάσει, "He will act gloriously," and the Vulgate, combining both conceptions, translates: quanto miraculo dividat Dominus.

8. *And all these thy servants shall come to me* (וירדו), scilicet, from the palace. The word *to descend*, is, as Rosenmüller observes, used, not because the royal palace is situated on a higher elevation, but because, according to the Hebrew idiom, going from a nobler place to one of less distinction, is called descending to it; and thus kings, or royal officers, *descend* from the palace to private houses. Compare *C. B. Michaelis*, Com. Theol. v. p. 445. See xii. 31.—וכל העם אשר ברגליך. *And all the people that follow*

צֵא אַתָּה וְכָל־הָעָם אֲשֶׁר־בְּרַגְלֶיךָ וְאַחֲרֵי־כֵן אֵצֵא וַיֵּצֵא מֵעִם־פַּרְעֹה
בָּחֳרִי־אָף׃ ס 9 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־
מֹשֶׁה לֹא־יִשְׁמַע אֲלֵיכֶם פַּרְעֹה לְמַעַן רְבוֹת מוֹפְתַי בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃
10 וּמֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן עָשׂוּ אֶת־כָּל־הַמֹּפְתִים הָאֵלֶּה לִפְנֵי פַרְעֹה
וַיְחַזֵּק יְהוָה אֶת־לֵב פַּרְעֹה וְלֹא־שִׁלַּח אֶת־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאַרְצוֹ׃ ס

thee. Thus almost all the modern translators. Targum Onkelos, indistinctly, "All the people that is with thee;" Ebn Ezra, "Who are under thy authority;" Rashi, "Who follow thy advice and conduct;" Septuagint, *καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαός σου οὗ σὺ ἀφηγῇ*, "and all the people which thou leadest;" Vulgate, Et omnis populus, qui subjectus est tibi.—Moses was, in consequence of his supernatural miracles, and the veneration in which he was held by the Hebrews, considered by Pharaoh as the prince of the people, although the humility of Moses never led him to attempt civil or political authority, merely governing by the superiority of his intellect, and the infallibility of the divine inspiration under which he acted.—*And Moses went out from Pharaoh in burning anger* (חֳרִי—from חרה, to burn—heat). Now Moses only left Pharaoh's palace not to appear again before him on his own accord (x. 29).

9, 10. The transactions before Pharaoh are finished; God had shown to the refractory monarch the infinitude of His power, without using it to a disastrous destruction of the Egyptians; this terrible catastrophe has now become inevitable by the inflexible obstinacy of the king: it is the culminating point in the soul-stirring tragedy narrated in our text, and with admirable skill, the inspired author, as if following the strict rules of artistic

CHAPTER XII.

Summary.—Before the final and decisive stroke, which forced Pharaoh to allow the departure of the Israelites, God commanded, through Moses, the laws connected with this miraculous event, and the ceremonies to be celebrated in commemoration thereof: the institution of the month of Abib as the first of the religious year; precepts regarding the selecting, killing, roasting and eating of the paschal-lamb; further, concerning the use of unleavened bread from the fifteenth to the twenty-first day of Abib, and respecting the persons who are to be admitted to the paschal-lamb (see a survey of these rites in the notes on verse 1).—Then, on the fourteenth of Nisan, in the evening, while the Israelites were consuming the prescribed meal, all the first-born of Egypt, both men and beasts, are destroyed by a pestilence, to the great consternation of the Egyptians, and of Pharaoh, who now presses the departure of the Israelites with such eagerness that they had no time to leaven their bread. They left Egypt laden with the costly presents of the Egyptians, accompanied by many others not belonging to their nation. The first station to which they came was Succoth, south-east of Rameses, towards the coast of the Red Sea.

The Feast of Passover. (חג הפסח, or חג המצות). Ver. I.

The precepts concerning the celebration of the festival of Passover constitute the first of the Mosaic Laws, and the only one given in Egypt. Both the connection in which it is introduced, and the force with which it is enjoined, and the supplementary ordinances, which the legislator adds in the course of the Pentateuch, are unmistakable proofs of the paramount importance which is attached to that extraordinary festival.

a. The connection of the context in which the Passover is enforced, shows that it is

themselves to me, saying, Go out, thou and all the people that follow thee: and after that I shall go out.—And he went out from Pharaoh in burning anger.

9. And the Lord [1]had said before to Moses, Pharaoh [2]will not hearken to you, that my wonders may be multiplied in the land of Egypt. 10. And Moses and Aaron did all these wonders before Pharaoh: and the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart, so that he would not let the children of Israel go out of his land.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Said. [2] Shall.

composition, allows, before the real occurrence of the overwhelming event, a momentary pause, consisting in the standstill of the action, to refresh and to strengthen the mind of the reader for the last terrible blow. This is effected by the two following verses, in which all that has hitherto happened to Pharaoh is again summarily repeated, and the result of all the miracles wrought before him briefly stated. There is thus no progress in the narration intended, and the words: "and the Lord had said to Moses," are, therefore, to be understood of the previous revelations of God to Moses (ויאמר, Pluperfect, as ver. 1), not of a new communication, as Rashi observes; and the words: "that my wonders may be multiplied in the land of Egypt," refer to the past miracles, although they include also those which it is still intended to perform for the deliverance and glory of Israel and the punishment of the arbitrary and contumacious king.

---

intended as a symbol of the *national covenant* between God and Israel. This is manifest from the precepts that the paschal-lamb is to be eaten in the family circle, or, if this be too small to represent the national unity, together with another family besides (vers. 3, 4); from the express injunction that "the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel" shall kill it (ver. 6); for עדה, which occurs here for the first time, is the *national* community, which had developed itself out of former *families* (see Numb. i. 16; xvi. 2; and *Michaelis* Mosaisches Recht, i. § 45); from the otherwise singular precept, that the lamb is not to be dissected, but roasted with the head and the legs and the entrails (ver. 9, compare ver. 46), as a representation of the wholeness or unity of Israel; and especially from the circumstances, that the revelation of the Law stands in immediate connection with the Exodus (for Pentecost is called the חג עצרת, or feast of conclusion to Passover, see on xxiii. 16), that only circumcised individuals are permitted to partake of the paschal-lamb (ver. 48), and that this is to be killed in Jerusalem only, at the temple, the great centre of the national unity of the Israelites (Deut. xvi. 5—7). The law concerning Passover, is, in this respect, analogous to that of circumcision, which is to be considered as an *individual covenant* between God and every single Israelite (see *infra* on xx. 8). The latter was given to one man at a time, when this one individual only acknowledged and worshipped God; the former was enjoined at a period when the adorers of the true God had increased to a numerous nation, and were on the point of being vested with political independence, and of being led, *as a nation*, to a great and fertile land, to inhabit it as their exclusive inheritance. From this point of view the character of Passover, as a festival of liberty or redemption, is self-evident, although only accessory. The deliverance of Israel from

Egyptian thraldom is only the negative element in that memorable event; the closer relation with God, into which Israel as a people is brought thereby, forms its positive and more important characteristic: they *ceased* to be physically slaves, and *began* to become spiritually the messengers of divine truth; whilst the one tended only to diminish their external woe, the other was calculated to free their minds from the fetters of superstition and ignorance, to enlighten their intellects, to ennoble their souls, and, in a word, to render them worthy to be the "chosen people" of the Almighty.

b. A not less obvious proof of the importance of this great initiatory festival, is the *force* with which it is enjoined. Its solemnization is not only repeatedly, emphatically, and even pathetically enforced, but any one who disregards any of its more essential precepts is threatened with the solemn and awful punishment, "that his soul shall be cut off from Israel," not by earthly authorities, but by the divine Judge himself (see Levit. xx. 5, 6); or, with other words, those who neglect the precepts connected with the festival of the national covenant between God and Israel, cease, *eo ipso*, to belong to that privileged community, because they disavow that which is the sign and fundamental condition of the covenant; as those who neglect the circumcision (at which the same phrase is used) have individually destroyed their union with God. Passover is the natal day of Israel's political existence; it is the commencement of its historical vocation, the transition from individual degradation to national glory, the primary condition of its elevation to a holy people, and, therefore, in its innermost purport, closely kindred with the sanctity of Sabbath, which is, indeed, in the Decalogue, based on the deliverance from Egyptian thraldom (compare Isa. xliii. 1, 15—17; Deut. v. 12—17). Hence the inexorable severity with which the laws of Passover are enforced; they concern not single accessory precepts, but the very root of Mosaism in its historical genesis. (About the punishment of *excision*, כרת, see *Abarbanel* on Numb. xv; *Selden*, De Synedriis, i. 6; *Munk*, Palest. p. 214; *Ewald*, Antiq. p. 142. We shall on future occasions, recur to this subject).

c. But the legislator, in order to impress the significance of this festival still more energetically, returns to it on different occasions anew, in order to give such additional prescriptions as might be required for its most appropriate and acceptable celebration. However, none of those supplementary laws are superfluous additions (as has been advanced by those critics who see a variety of authors in the Pentateuch), but essential injunctions, in perfect harmony with the primary law on Passover, in the following manner: 1st. xii. 1—20, contains the fundamental laws which God communicated to Moses concerning the paschal-lamb, its preparation, the manner in which it is to be eaten, and the use of unleavened bread. 2nd. In ver. 21—28, Moses informs his co-religionists of the precepts concerning the paschal-lamb, and the use which was at that time to be made of the blood. 3rd. Verses 43—49 specify the individuals who are allowed to participate in the lamb, and who not. 4th. In xiii. 3—10 Moses communicates to the people the precepts of the unleavened bread. 5th. In xxiii. 15, is a brief allusion to the preceding laws of Passover, the mention of which could not entirely be omitted in the enumeration of the preliminary laws contained in chap. xxi. to xxiii, constituting a little whole for themselves, and embodying, in a brief but distinct sketch, the principal statutes of the holy code (see *infra*, note on xxi. 1, beginning). 6th. xxxiv. 18, forms a part of the renewal of the divine covenant with Israel, which had been destroyed by the sin of the golden calf. 7th. In Levit. xxiii. 4—8, Passover is mentioned in its due place in the system of Hebrew festivals, and ver. 9—14 contains the regulations about the firstlings. 8th. Numb. ix. 1—14 embodies the law concerning those who were, in the first month of the year, by some cause, prevented from duly celebrating the Passover; and the general character of the festival is briefly premised only in order the easier to introduce that additional law. 9th. Numb. xxviii. 16—25 describes the sacrifices to be offered on Passover. 10th. Deut. xvi. 5—7 ordains, that the festival is to be celebrated by the whole nation at the common sanctuary.

It is needless to add, with what importance tradition hallowed the sanctity of Passover, which complicated system of laws rabbinical interpretation has erected on the basis of the Biblical precepts, and with what scrupulous conscientiousness its prescriptions are still observed by the Jewish people, and even by those, who otherwise do not strictly adhere to the ritual injunctions of Mosaism, so that the celebration of Passover, even with the greatest sacrifices, has become a standing proverbial characteristic of the Hebrew nation (for instance, in the sentence, פסחא בביתא והלילא מתברי אברייאת, "If the Passover is celebrated in the house, the shouts of joy resound without," Talmud Jerusalem, Pesach 27. *b*). It is thus clear, that Passover was always considered as pre-eminent among the national festivals of Israel, both on account of its political importance, and its solemn religious character. It is considered second to no precept except circumcision; it has the significance of a sacrament; it was formerly the only expiatory sacrifice, which every Israelite could offer personally without the mediation of the priest; thus the paschal-lamb showed manifestly Israel as "a kingdom of priests"; it connected the individual with God, as a member of the chosen community, and with his brethren, as leading to the same divine sovereignty. Those who neglected to pay this annual debt broke off their connection alike with God and their fellow-citizens. Both the Israelites and their enemies were fully impressed with the paramount religious influence, which the due observance of Passover, that cornerstone and basis of the national life of Israel, exercised upon the people. Hezekiah commenced his great religious reform with an invitation to all the tribes of Israel to repair to Jerusalem and to celebrate the festival of unleavened bread; and a perfect change in the religious aspect of the country was the almost immediate consequence (2 Chron. xxx. 1, 5, 13, 26; xxxii. 7, 8). On the other hand, the law of Justinian interdicted the Jews to hold the Passover before the Christians (*Baronii*, Annal. Eccl., ad an. 535, No. 45); the laws of Ricared in Spain forbade the Jews to celebrate the Passover on the 14th of any month (Lex Visigoth: lib. xii. tit. 5: "Ne Judaei more suo celebrent pascha"); this law was, later, renewed and confirmed by the council of Toledo. All these and many similar enactments rooted in the conviction, that if the Jews had only been induced to disregard the precepts of Passover, a total neglect of their other religious rites would gradually ensue and alienate them from the faith of their ancestors.

Before we enter into the different ceremonies connected with this festival, we observe with regard to its name, that *Pesach* (פֶּסַח *πάσχα*, פִּסְחָא, from the old and antiquated root פסח, to pass over, perhaps kindred with פסע=פָּשַׂע step; Josephus, *ὑπερβασία*; Philó, *διαβατήρια*,—but by no means from *πάσχειν*, to suffer—with the accessory signification of leaving uninjured, or saving, see Isaiah, xxxi. 5; see on ver. 13), was originally only the lamb, which was to be killed and eaten before the exodus, and with the blood of which the door-posts and the lintels of the houses of the Israelites were to be marked, that the destroying angel might "pass over" them and "save" the Israelites (see Levit. xxiii. 5, 6; *Rashi* on ver. 11, דלוג). But as the Pesach introduces the whole festival, and is undeniably one of its most prominent (if not the most characteristic) features, as the evening of the fourteenth of Nisan is, according to the Hebrew calendar, the beginning of the fifteenth day, and as on that evening unleavened bread also was to be eaten with the paschal-lamb (ver. 8): it is natural, that that name imperceptibly lost its original limited meaning, and was applied for the whole festival of seven days, or of unleavened bread. Thus Josephus uses *πάσχα* and *τῶν ἀζυμῶν ἑορτή*, as synonymous (Antiq. XIV. ii. 1; XVII. ix. 3; Bell. Jud. II. i. 3; VI. ix. 3).

It is naturally divided into two parts: 1. The introductory sacrifice, or the Pesach *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, in the evening (בין הערבים, see note to ver. 6) of the fourteenth day of Nisan; and 2. The principal festival, or the feast of unleavened bread from the fifteenth to the twenty-first of the same month.

1. *a*) The Pesach was to be a male lamb or goat, one year old, and without blemish (ver. 5)—the usual requisites in every sacrifice. However, Jewish tradition fixed the use of a *lamb* for this purpose; and the Targumim already render here invariably שה with אמר or אמרא, lamb (compare *Theodoret* in Exod. quaest. xxiv). *b*) It was killed in the precincts of the temple (Deut. xvi. 5—7)—certainly a considerable sacrifice for those who lived in the provinces—either by the house-father or a priest, towards the evening before sunset of the fourteenth day of the first month (Deut. xvi. 6), but only after all leaven had been removed from the houses (xxiii. 18). It is undoubtedly a "sacrifice"; it is called זבח פסח, or זבח חג הפסח, and belongs to the category of the שלמים (xxiv. 5); it is a peace- and thank-offering; and the annual renewal of the national convention between God and Israel. *c*) It was then roasted entirely without any portion being cut off (ver. 9); and *d*) consumed, in the holy city, by the whole family, either alone or together with other admissible guests, invited to the meal; so that *e*) nothing was left over to the following day; or if this was still the case, it was to be burnt forthwith (ver. 10); the fat especially was forbidden to remain over till the morning (xxiii. 18); *f*) *Bitter herbs* (מררים), as a symbol of the severe bondage, which they suffered in Egypt (i. 14); and *unleavened bread* (מצות), as an emblem of the haste with which they left the land (ver. 8), were to be eaten with the lamb. It is well known, that Jewish tradition now, since the temple is destroyed and consequently the paschal-lamb cannot be sacrificed, has gradually collected a complete order of service to be observed on the two first evenings of Passover (סדר הגדה על פסח), which contains a brief history of the events connected with the festival, several allegorical rites and copious hymns of praise, mostly Psalms.

2. *a*) The festival itself extended during seven days (*Josephus*—Antiq. II. xv. 1—mentions eight days of Passover, including the fourteenth day of Nisan, on which already all leaven was to be removed from the house); under penalty of extirpation, "unleavened bread," or "bread of misery" (לחם עני, Deut. xvi. 3), was to be eaten (see note on ver. 8). *b*) All leavened bread and leaven were to be removed from the house during that time, under the same severe punishment. *c*) The first and the seventh day are days of holy convocation (מקרא קדש), celebrated with particular sanctity (ver. 16), like the Sabbath (Lev. xxiii. 11, 15), by abstaining from all work, except that which is indispensable for the preparation of the necessary meals. *d*) On each day certain holocausts (two young bullocks, one ram, seven lambs of the first year) with the necessary meat-offering, together with a sin-offering (one goat, Num. xxviii. 19—24), were offered in the name of the whole nation. Individuals sacrificed also thank-offerings and held convivial repasts (compare Deut. xvi. 2). *e*) In order to combine with this festival a feature of agricultural importance, and thus to enhance its historical or national significance by a more material and immediate personal interest, it was ordered, that on the second day of Passover, a ripe firstling sheaf (ראשית עמר) was to be offered up in the temple, accompanied by a burnt offering (a lamb one year old), and meat- and drink-offerings (Lev. xxiii. 10—14; see notes on xxiii. 14—17); and then only the corn-harvest was universally permitted and commenced (except in some southern parts, as around Jericho, where the harvest was begun before that time, from fear lest the grains fall out of the over-ripe ears. Robinson found the wheat-harvest almost finished in the vicinity of Jericho on the thirteenth of May, the barley-harvest three weeks earlier). Every return of the Passover festival was intended to remind the Israelites of their national regeneration, and of their transition from a scattered state of single-life to a well-founded political unity. Nothing could, therefore, be more appropriate than to bring it into connection with the regeneration of nature and the progress of vernal vegetation. Josephus (Antiq. III. x. 5) describes the offering of the first-fruits in the following manner: "They take a handful of the ears, and dry them, then beat them small, and purge the barley from the bran; they then bring one tenth deal to the altar, to God; and casting one handful of it upon the fire, they leave

the rest for the use of the priest; and after this it is, that they may publicly or privately reap their harvest." It must, however, be observed, that in the festival of Passover, this agricultural feature is, in significance, decidedly inferior to its historical and religious meaning.—*f*) In the five days between the first and the seventh day of Passover, the assembled multitude indulged no doubt in public amusements, as dances and songs, to fill up the time in harmony with the joyful and solemn character of the festival (Judg. xxi. 21, 23). The occupations permitted on these five middle days (חול המועד) were later strictly regulated by rabbinical laws (see Tract. Moed Katon; compare notes on xxiii. 16). *g*) Those who were unclean on the fourteenth day of Nisan, or far distant from the temple, or by any other cause precluded from celebrating the Passover, are to solemnize it from the fourteenth day of the second month (Num. ix. 11; 2 Chron. xxx. 2, 15). This is called by the Talmud פסח שני, "the second Passover," which is to be kept in the same manner as prescribed for the ordinary festival (*Josephus*, Bell. Jud. VI. ix. 3).—About Pentecost, which is to be considered as the necessary conclusion of Passover, especially in the individual, agricultural, and material view, as the festival of the first show-bread, symbolizing the perfect completion of the corn-harvest throughout the country, and, according to Jewish tradition, also in the historical, national, and spiritual respect, as the festival of Legislation, see note on xxiii. 16 B.

These general precepts concerning the permanent celebration of Passover (פסח דרות see ver. 14), were necessarily modified at the time of the exodus from Egypt (פסח מצרים), when that festival was first instituted, and when several features and ceremonies were not symbols, but the necessary results of circumstances. These alterations are: *a*) The paschal-lamb was to be selected already on the tenth of Nisan, in order to allow due time for its proper choice (see on ver. 3). *b*) It was to be killed in the houses of the Israelites by the head of each family; after which a bundle of hyssop was to be dipped in its blood, and the lintel and the door-posts marked with it, both as a guide for the destroying angel, and as a public and open ceremony before the eyes of the Egyptians (vers. 6, 7, 22). According to tradition, this act of marking the door-posts was limited to the Passover in Egypt, and not repeated at its later celebrations, although this appears to be against the clear instructions of Moses, vers. 24—28. (see Ebn Ezra on ver. 24). But as the lambs were, in Palestine, killed at the national sanctuary, the door-posts of the houses could, as a matter of course, not be marked with their blood. *c*) It was to be consumed quickly, and quite in the costume of travellers, "their loins girded, their shoes on their feet, and their sticks in their hands" (ver. 11). *d*) Unleavened bread was not necessarily eaten during the whole seven days (see Mishn. Pesach. ix. 5), although the Israelites were almost compelled to do so, because they had no time to prepare leavened bread (ver. 39). *e*) The festival lasted only one day, as the departure from Egypt took place already in the night of the fourteenth of Nisan. *f*) The women shared the meal of the paschal-lamb, whereas, later, the men alone were bound to partake of it (xxiii. 17; Deut. xvi. 6—7, 16). *g*) Those who were infected with a Levitical impurity were, in Egypt, not excluded from the Pesach, as at that time laws regulating purity and impurity did not yet exist (Num. ix. 6—14). *h*) No firstlings were offered; and *i*) no sacrifices were killed in Egypt, from obvious reasons (Num. xxviii. 16—24)

After such strict and rigid commands concerning the Passover, many thought it a suspicious circumstance, that we find in the historical records of the Old Testament so few direct allusions to its celebration; and they have therefore rashly concluded, that the origin of the Passover is of a far later date than the time of Moses. But against these objections we observe: 1. That history is not required to record the regularly recurring festivals, and that this omission can, therefore, not be used as an argument against the authority of the Pentateuch. But, 2, we find, indeed, a clear mention of Passover in the following passages: *a*) in Josh. v. 10—11, at the arrival of the Israel-

ites in Canaan; *b*) 2 Chron. viii. 13, under Solomon; *c*) 2 Chron. xxx. 15, in the time of Hezekiah; *d*) 2 Kings xxiii. 21, under Josiah; compare 2 Chron. xxxv.; *e*) Ezra vi. 19, 22, after the return from Babylon. If we add hereto the passages, in which the Passover is also probably, though less distinctly, alluded to (Judges vi. 8; xi. 40; xxi. 19; 1 Sam. i. 3; *Hengstenberg* Auth. ii. p. 79—85): we cannot doubt, that according to the historical evidence of our Biblical records, Passover was celebrated by the Hebrews during the whole period from Moses to the exile, although in different times with more or less strictness and solemnity. We have, therefore, no reason to doubt that the Passover dates from so early a time as that of Moses.

But the contrary opinion, that it was celebrated by the descendants of Abraham, prior to the period of Moses, has as often, and with as much pertinacity, been advanced. Ewald (Antiq. p. 356, *et seq.*), mentions the Pesach among the festivals instituted before Moses. Thus other reasons must be assigned for that festival than the exodus from Egypt. Now, it is generally alleged, that the Hebrews, in common with all other Semitic, or, rather, eastern tribes, which, as agricultural nations, are perfectly dependent on the seasons and the course of the celestial orbs, especially the sun, celebrated two principal annual festivals, namely, one at the beginning of the spring, when the corn began to ripen, that is, at the time when the sun "passes over" into the sign of Aries (*Bohlen*), and this is פֶּסַח (analogous to a similar festival celebrated about that time in India, Persia, and Egypt, and called Naurûz, or Huli, or Hilarian, διαβατήρια, see, however, on ver. 13); and the other at the beginning of the autumn, when the last fruits are gathered in, and the earth assumes a similar important position to the sun; which festival is identical with Succoth (סכות); and, in order to show reverence to the moon also, the second great orb, both festivals were celebrated, when it presents to the earth its whole face illuminated. It is added, that, on both occasions the fresh grains of barley were quickly ground the same day, from which flour they baked unleavened bread; or they were merely roasted by the fire, or ground in a mortar; the latter was offered on the altars; the unleavened bread served as food for the people. Herewith an expiatory sacrifice was generally connected, as this was a critical season, deciding either the fertility or barrenness of the year; and this, it is asserted, was the Pesach, or "the passing over," or the "rescue," which shielded from misfortune (as the Egyptians used, at such festivals, to sacrifice a ram to Jupiter Ammon; *Tacit.* Hist. v. 4), and with the blood the lintel and the door-posts of the houses were marked, as if to expiate the whole house and its inhabitants (as the ancient Peruvians reddened their temples and houses, in order to symbolize the triumph of the sun over the winter, and his renewed power). The meat was eaten roasted, because it was believed, as is still the case in India, that the eating of raw meat makes human nature savage and blood-thirsty (see *Bohlen* Gen. Introd. p. 140; *Vatke*, Relig. of the Old Test. i. p. 492; *Lengerke*, Kenaan, p. 381, etc.).

We are far from denying the natural historical connection between the Israelites and the other Oriental nations; on the contrary, it is the avowed aim of this commentary always impartially to point out that connection, in order to produce a faithful picture of the general development of the Israelitish institutions; but, although it is not impossible that the Hebrews, before Moses, celebrated similar astrological festivals about the time of the full moon of the first and seventh month—for the majority adhered then to such pagan customs and rites, Josh. xxiv. 14; Ez. xx. 7—it must be distinctly understood that none of the festivals of Israel, *as they are contained and ordered in the Mosaic code*, has any bearing or reference whatever to heathen ceremonies; the reason and origin of each holy day is, in all instances, clearly derived from events connected with the history of Israel, or the doctrines for the first time promulgated by Moses; so that, if even in remote antiquity the Hebrews celebrated festivals analogous in their rites, and coinciding in times, with those instituted by the Mosaic law, these festivals and rites were, by this legislation, placed on a perfectly different

basis; the rites received another, original significance; the times were brought into accordance with historical events, and the whole ceremonies divested from all superstitious or idolatrous elements, spiritualized, and from arbitrary and often absurd customs elevated into symbols full of enlightening truth for the mind, and ennoblement for the heart. Even the most inveterate and radical critics will not be able to find in the *Mosaic* law of Passover any connection with the course of the sun or other astrological elements, or in the paschal-lamb a resemblance to the ram sacrificed by the Egyptians to Jupiter Ammon, or in the marking of the door-posts an imitation of the custom of the Egyptians, "to oil at the vernal equinox, cattle, trees, and other objects, to protect them against the destroying fire of the sun, because on that day the world was once destroyed by fire" (*Lengerke*, Ken. p. 421), or in the eating of the unleavened bread the custom of agricultural eastern nations to eat unleavened barley-cakes at the festivals celebrated at the beginning of the harvest (*Wilson* on xiii. 7), as this analogy would require the command of unleavened bread at least on the feast of weeks also; or any reference whatever to heathen customs. Are those writers prepared to deny the historical fact of the exodus? or to prove the improbability of a festival based on such an event? Is there any contradiction in the internal character of the festival? or does the Biblical account betray the least uncertainty or indistinctness? Are there any cosmical or astronomical elements discernible in the rites as detailed in our chapter? and is not the historical and ethical foundation pointed out with singular clearness and force? If, therefore, indeed, there prevailed, in primeval times, among the Asiatic nations, a superstition which the Hebrews had also adopted, we are forced still more to admire the power of abstraction, and the vigour of their intellect, with which they converted a superstition into a sublime doctrine. These remarks apply equally to all Hebrew festivals and rites, traces or analogies of which might be found among other nations also. And in this sense, Lengerke himself (Ken. p. 456), remarks: "We must, however, confess, that the Mosaic laws, although based on, and derived from, institutions and rites of natural religion, are perfectly free from such elements, and are exclusively connected with the purest notions of monotheism. The law bore, therefore, to the people the character of an entirely new legislation, since it combated and disowned even every affinity with historical or natural ceremonies" (compare also *Ewald*, Antiquities, p. 115; *Origen*, contr. Cels. ed. Spencer, p. 259). In the Mosaic institutions, we must clearly distinguish between the external symbolical form and their internal character. It is true, the former frequently coincides with that of pagan religions; and this was natural from the course of the universal development of mankind, and from the condition of the Hebrew nation in particular. The vocation of the people of Israel did not imply a transplanting from the soil of its time into another later period; not a magical and miraculous uprooting from every connection with the world and with nature; no leap over the stages of development inherent in the nature of the human race; but a training of the people, which yet was entirely to remain a nation of its own time, and which was subject to the general laws of human progress. Perfectly different is the relation in which the *internal* character of the Mosaic rites stands to those of heathen antiquity. Paganism is natural religion, deification of nature in its whole extent; its basis is pantheism. If the idea of the unity of the Deity sometimes breaks through as a dim and vague notion, it implies no personal being with self-consciousness and self-activity, but something impersonal; it soon dissolves itself again into an infinite multiplicity of gods, the mere personifications of the various powers of nature. Above all moral government, stands the necessity of nature, the fate to which gods and men must bend—the highest moral perfection at which man can arrive is the completest resignation under the iron rule of necessity; the barren, gloomy virtue of the stoic is the culminating point of heathen ethics; a passive identification with fate or the natural events, is the ideal of a pagan sage. But the God of Israel is abso-

lutely *one*, spiritual, perfectly and thoroughly personal; no abstract notion, but a concrete being, as evidently existing as the human soul which He has bestowed, and which is a part of His infinite essence. He is not identical with the world; He is its Framer; the universe is subjected to Him, and obeys His will; it is merely ordained to proclaim His might and His glory; it is a witness of His omnipotence, but not the *entire* emanation of His power. He has created the world, and has thereby lost no particle of His boundless might; He pervades the universe, and His spirit is yet one and undivided. He covers Himself with light as with a garment, and stretches out the heavens like a curtain. But even if the heavens vanish away like smoke, and the earth decays like a garment, His glory will exist through all eternity. (See Psalm civ. 2; Isaiah li. 6; comp. *Creuzer*, Symb. iv. p. 151; *Baur*, Symb. i. p. 166; *Baehr*, Symb. i. 34; ii. 640).

Mackay (in his work "Religious Development of the Hebrews") asserts, with much boldness, but very little plausibility, "that the Passover was already celebrated according to the rites of Moloch, or the atrocities of cannibalism, and that it was notoriously in relation with the sacrificial (!) infanticide of the Hebrews." It is easier to send forth such startling paradoxical opinions than to defend them; and even Wilson, the unconditional and enthusiastic admirer of Mackay, finds that this supposition is not based upon "cogent reasons."

It is further, we grieve to remark, but too well known, that some confused, and, we must add, malevolent writers, have endeavoured to spread the monstrous conjecture, that the Israelites performed human sacrifices at their Passover rites. Ghillany, in a book devoted to that subject, writes (p. 518): "At the time of the first temple they killed, for every section of the Israelites, a man, mixed his blood among the bread instead of leaven, and ate this bread, to which they attributed an expiating power; then the body of the killed was roasted,"—we shudder while we transcribe it—"and every Hebrew was obliged to eat a piece of this flesh for the atonement of his sins." Such fathomless, incredible absurdity, would naturally excite nothing but our pity and ridicule, had it not, unfortunately, led the credulous and fanatic mob, in several countries, to bloodshed, rapine, and sanguinary persecution of the innocent Israelites. A religion, which forcibly and repeatedly enjoins to abstain even from the blood of *animals*, "because it is the soul," should sanction the mixing of the sacred bread of Passover with *human* blood? A religion, which gives so many detailed and strict prescriptions concerning clean and unclean animals, should authorize the abomination of human flesh "for the atonement of sin?" A religion—but we think it unnecessary to dilate upon that monstrous aspersion, which is, indeed, thrown among an ignorant population, like a firebrand levelled by a maniac into a wooden city, but which has never been, nor *can* it be, substantiated by any argument taken either from the law or the practice of the Hebrews. May all future generations be spared the shame of witnessing a renewal of such ignominious scenes as those which excited Europe, not many

יב 1 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וְאֶל־אַהֲרֹן בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם לֵאמֹר׃
2 הַחֹדֶשׁ הַזֶּה לָכֶם רֹאשׁ חֳדָשִׁים רִאשׁוֹן הוּא לָכֶם לְחָדְשֵׁי

2. *This month* (אביב or ניסן) *shall be to you the beginning of months; it shall be the first month of the year to you.* The translation of the Septuagint (which has been adopted by Houbigant and others): πρῶτός ἐστι, κ.τ.λ.; "this month *is* to you the first of the year," would render this verse strangely superfluous, as no twofold emphatical assertion would be required to state a fact supposed to have been known to every Israelite. It is, thus, evident from the tenor of our verse, that previous to the institution of Passover a different chronology, with regard to the

years since, in consequence of those hideous calumnies, which only the magnanimity and influence of a Sir Moses Montefiore has been able to silence.

We will, however, mention, that among the many absurdities which ancient writers relate concerning Hebrew customs and rites (see *Introduction*, § 3), it is also asserted by Apion (Josephus *c.* Apion, ii. 8), that the Israelites annually fed in the temple, and then sacrificed, a Greek stranger; and, from the circumstances that the Hebrews celebrated the seventh day, which is the day of Chronos (Saturni dies, Saturday), and that the Egyptians offered to Osiris, the son of Chronos, human sacrifices (*Plutarch*, De Iside, § 73), the fable was spread, that the Hebrews sacrificed annually a human being! (see notes on xx. 8—11). Modern critics of the opposite schools, as Hengstenberg and Ewald, reject the opinion of those who pretend to conclude, from the trial of Abraham (Gen. xxii), and the vow of Jephthah (Judges xi), that human sacrifices were not unusual among the Hebrews; and those who still repeat this opinion, have certainly less scientific impartiality than fanatic malice. Some have even found in the character of the Pesach, a resemblance to the adoration of Moloch (see *Nork*, Bibl. Mythol. i. p. 41), an hypothesis as arbitrary as it is extravagant. The Biblical records must, indeed, be read with a singular bias, if such senseless conjectures, devoid of every basis, or even appearance of probability, are the deplorable result of those researches.

The further and more detailed explanation of the rites and precepts connected with Passover, will be found in the notes on the verses in which they are first mentioned.

The internal structure and unity of perhaps no part of Exodus have been more questioned than those of the twelfth chapter (see *Vater*, Pent. ii. 32; *De Wette*, Beiträge, ii. 193; *George*, Die Jüdischen Feste, p. 88). But, without enumerating the various objections raised, we give here the obvious and clear connection of the different verses: 1st. ver. 1—13, the commands of God concerning the first Passover in Egypt; 2nd. ver. 14—20, regarding its future celebration; 3rd. ver. 21—27, Moses communicates to the Israelites the import of those commands; 4th. ver. 28, the Israelites make the necessary preparations for the paschal-lamb, and the other ceremonies to be observed in the evening of the fourteenth day of Nisan; 5th. ver. 29—39, the history of the tenth plague, and of the Exodus of the Israelites; 6th. vers. 40, 41, historical notice respecting the duration of the Israelites' sojourn in Egypt; 7th. ver. 42, the sacred character of the night of the Exodus, for all future times, is emphatically enjoined; 8th. ver. 43—49, precepts with regard to the persons to be admitted to the paschal-lamb; 9th. ver. 50, the remark that the Israelites followed these precepts, to which, in ver. 51, as an appropriate conclusion, the principal event related in the chapter is briefly repeated. Thus the whole chapter is in perfect harmony with its parts; it is evidently written after the event; and the inspired author had, therefore, already a sufficiently clear conception of the character of Passover to enable him logically to combine the precepts concerning its present and future celebration.

CHAP. XII. 1. And the Lord spoke to Moses and to Aaron in the land of Egypt, saying: 2. This month *shall be* to you the beginning of months; it *shall be* the first

months, was in use among the Hebrews, and, although we have no direct statements in the Bible, it is easy to conjecture, if we compare Exod. xxiii. 16, with Josephus, Antiq. I. iii. 3, that the seventh month (later called Tishri), in which the harvest was perfectly completed, was considered as the beginning of the year. For we read, in Exod. xxiii. 16: "the festival of in-gathering, or of Tabernacle, is to be celebrated at the end of the year" (בצאת השנה), and although that festival was fixed upon the fifteenth of Tishri, apparently the *beginning* of the

הַשָּׁנָה׃ 3 דַּבְּרוּ אֶל־כָּל־עֲדַת יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר בֶּעָשֹׂר לַחֹדֶשׁ הַזֶּה

year, this date might yet, as a general term, be understood as the end of the old year, as the new circle of agricultural labours for the following harvest commenced only *after* that festival; and Josephus (*loc. cit.*) observes: "Moses appointed that *Nisan*, which is the same with Xanthicus, should be the first month for their festivals, because he brought them out of Egypt in that month; so that this month began the year as to all the solemnities they observed to the honour of God, although he preserved the original order of the months [from Tishri], as to selling and buying, and other worldly affairs." It is natural, that an agricultural people like the Hebrews, considered their *civil* year concluded with the termination of the harvest, which entirely finished the compass of their annual labours, and after which commenced a new cycle, or year, characterized by the same occupations, the same hopes, and the same anxieties. But, in order to keep alive in the midst of the people the memory of the miraculous redemption from Egypt, this event was to be considered as the beginning of a new epoch; so that, 1st. not only the *years* were counted from it (see Exod. xvi. 1; xix. 1; xl. 1; Numb. i. 1; ix. 1; x. 11; xxxiii. 38; Deut. v. 1; 1 Kings vi. 1, etc.), but, 2nd. also *the months*, simply as the second, third, fourth month, etc. But neither of the two chronologies have been long or exclusively observed; the *years* were, later, inaccurately described after the reign of the kings, or the abduction of the Israelites into the exile (Ezek. xxxiii. 21; xl. 1), and the *months* received, after the Babylonian captivity, foreign, probably Chaldee, names (ניסן ,אייר ,סיון, etc., already used in the later books of the Old Testament, Ezra, Esther, Nehemiah), which stand in no connection with the historical reminiscences of Israel. The names חדש האביב (xiii. 4) "month of ears," for the first month of the year; חדש זו (1 Kings vi. 1, 37) "the month of splendour, or of flowers," for the second month; ירח איתנים (1 Kings viii. 2), "the month of perennial streams," for the seventh month, and ירח בול (1 Kings vi. 38), "the month of rain," for the eighth month—these appear to be more appellative than proper names. Thus, the Hebrew calendar has a double New-year, one on the first day of Tishri (תשרי, from שרא, to open), for *political* and *civil* transactions, the more convenient for the later times, because the Seleucidic era—מנין שטרות, æra contractuum—commenced likewise in October (B. C. 312); and the other on the first day of Nisan, for the regulation of the *religious* festivals; *although the positive injunction of our verse, and the usual mode of counting the months throughout the Bible, lead us to suppose, that for many centuries after Moses, Nisan was alone considered the legal beginning of the year, and that, only with the adoption of the Chaldean calendar, Tishri was counted as the opening month of the year*. This seems to have taken place a considerable time after the introduction of the Seleucidic era, and we meet with it in no earlier Hebrew work than the Second Book of the Maccabbees, or not before B. C. 130. Now, it is known, that the Hebrews reckoned by lunar months, which is, indeed, the simplest and most obvious calculation for a people little advanced in astronomy, the regular return of the new moon offering a natural measure of time. As, however, the principal Hebrew festivals had a close connection with the produce of agriculture, that is, with the influence of the *sun*, as, for instance, on Passover the first ripe ears of corn were offered in the temple, and on Pentecost the harvest was considered completed, and as the lunar year has only 354 days, 8 hours (48 min., 38 sec.), and, therefore, differs from the solar year (which has 365 days, 5 hours, 48 min., 45 sec.), annually by nearly 11 days; it was necessary, in order to prevent interruptions in the festivals, to make, from time to time, such intercalations as to make both years

month of the year to you. 3. Speak to all the congregation of Israel, saying, On the tenth *day* of this month they shall take for themselves *every* man a lamb [1]for a

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—According to the house of their fathers.

agree as nearly as possible. How this was effected, in the times before the exile, it is impossible now to conjecture; the present Jewish calendar (תקופת רב אדא) has, in the year 357 A. C., been regulated by Rabbi Hillel, the younger, after a cycle of nineteen years (מחזור, Metonic cycle), each of which contains seven embolismic or leap years (שנות מעברות, namely, the third, sixth, eighth, eleventh, fourteenth, seventeenth and nineteenth year), when one month (אדר שני, or אדר בתראה, or ואדר), is added after the last month. For the chief consideration in arranging the Hebrew calendar must always have been the state of the crops in February or March. If they were then sufficiently advanced to warrant a hope that they would, one month later, yield ripe firstlings-ears for the offering of Passover, no alteration was adopted with regard to the calendar. But if the grains were in a backward state so as to justify no such expectation, the intercalation of a certain number of days was necessary, to allow the corn to ripen; and this matter was, later, systematically fixed by the Metonic cycle. The months contain, alternately, thirty and twenty-nine days (חדש מלא, and חדש חסר). Thus the assertion of Maimonides (Hilch. Kidd. Hachod. i. 1) is perfectly correct: "the months of the year are lunar months, but the years which we compute, are solar years;" and the Jewish calendar is, therefore, a strange and complicated mixture of the lunar and solar systems (similar to the chronology of the Chinese and the Indians). It is, however, so well regulated, that even a Scaliger admits "that there is nothing more exact, nothing more perfect, than the calculation of the Jewish year." Less acceptable is Maimonides' opinion (leaning on Talm. Rosh. Hash. 20. *a*), that in our verse lunar months are introduced, whereas, before that time, other divisions of the year were in use; for, in this verse, *the order* of the months only, not their duration or character is altered. These remarks will suffice for the understanding of our passage; for further conjectures about this difficult and disputed subject (certain facts and results there are little more than those here condensed) we refer to *J. D. Michaelis*, De Mensibus Hebraeorum, and Mos. R. iv. § 199; *Reland*, Antiq. Sacr. iv. 1; *Benfey und Stern*, Ueber die Monatsnamen einiger alten Völker; *Ideler*, Chronol. i; *Bendavid*, Berechnung und Geschichte des Jüdischen Calenders; *Vignoles*, Chronologie de L'Histoire Sainte, i. p. 684; see also *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. i. p. 530—533, and ii. p. 102; *Cassel*, on Cusari, pp. 120, 251, 260, 261. But the principal work on this subject is Maimonides' celebrated treatise: Kiddush Hachodesh, Latin by Lud. de Compiegne de Veil. London, 1683.

The time of the first month (ניסן) is thus described by Josephus (Antiq. III. x. 5): "The month of Xanthicus which is the beginning of our year, when the sun is in Aries;" and he calls it elsewhere (Antiq. II. xiv. 6), corresponding with the Egyptian month Pharmuthi, which was then, according to Ideler (Chron. i. 143), from the 27th of March to the 25th of April of the Julian Calendar.

3. *Speak to all the congregation of Israel* (כל עדת ישראל), in which introductory words already the national unity of the people of Israel is alluded to; every independent individual is included in this command. The paschal-lamb was already to be chosen on the tenth day of Nisan, according to the context only for that one Passover in Egypt, not for the future celebration of the festival, although some commentators

וְיִקְחוּ לָהֶם אִישׁ שֶׂה לְבֵית־אָבֹת שֶׂה לַבָּיִת׃ 4 וְאִם־יִמְעַט
הַבַּיִת מִהְיוֹת מִשֶּׂה וְלָקַח הוּא וּשְׁכֵנוֹ הַקָּרֹב אֶל־בֵּיתוֹ בְּמִכְסַת

suppose, that this precept applies also to פסח דרות. The lamb was to be *chosen*, that it might assume in the eyes of the Israelites a peculiar character; a character of significance and holiness. That it was to be chosen on the *tenth* day of the month, whilst the commencement of the festival was fixed for the evening belonging to the *fifteenth*, seems also to be characteristic. We find, indeed, a similar correspondence between the tenth and fifteenth day in the festivals of the seventh month (Tishri); and there are traces of the particular distinction, attached to the number ten in the Pentateuch, as the ten generations from Adam to Noah, and as many from Noah to Abraham, ten plagues in Egypt, ten commandments, etc. There are even signs, however faint, of the existence, in primeval times, of a week consisting of ten days. In Gen. xxiv. 55, Laban says: "Let the virgin remain with us *some days, or ten* (ימים או עשור)," which seems to signify, a few days, or a week of ten days (the form עשור is grammatically analogous to שבוע). In some parts of Asia there is still in use a small week of five days, to which a larger week of ten days would correspond. "For," observes Ewald (Antiq., p. 105), "the lunar month was then divided into four parts, and thus a week of seven days was formed; or it was divided into three sections, each of which was a week of ten days; and thus the numbers seven and ten gradually assumed a sacred character" (compare note on xxiii. 10—12). But although it is not impossible that the Hebrews had, in common with other Asiatic nations, in times beyond the researches of history, a week consisting of ten days; the Pentateuch knows from its very first chapter only the hebdomadal week.—Tradition observes, that the four days between the tenth and fourteenth of Nisan were necessary to examine, whether the lamb was faultless, or to impress the merciful deliverance of the Israelites still deeper upon their minds by leaving the lamb, the symbol of that redemption, for a longer time before their eyes; or (*Maimonides*, Moreh. Neb. iii. 46) to give time for the circumcision, which had been neglected in Egypt by many Israelites (see vers. 44, 48). We believe that a certain scope was necessary for a whole enthralled nation to procure a lamb of such a peculiar description, and especially for the poorer members of the community, whom their more favoured brethren were bound to provide with it.—בעשר לחדש instead of בעשר יום החדש, for the preposition ל is employed to express the genitive, if the governing substantive is omitted; which is chiefly the case with *son*, (for instance, כלאב לאביגיל, Chilab, *the son of* Abigail, 2 Sam. iii. 3); *day* (as in our passage; compare Gen. viii. 5; Deut. i. 3); and in headings (for instance לדוד, *song of* David; Ps. xxxvii. 1, etc.); or if the governed substantive precedes to enhance emphasis (for instance, לדוד על כסאו, on *David's* throne; Jer. xxii. 4); and in several other cases which we shall notice in due place.—ויקחו instead of ולקחו, *they shall take*. After expressions of time, the verb is, in Hebrew, frequently introduced with ו; for instance, xvi. 6, עֶרֶב וִידַעְתֶּם *in the evening you shall know*, ver. 7, בֹּקֶר וּרְאִיתֶם *in the morning you shall see*. See Gen. iii. 5; Isa. vi. 1; Prov. xxiv. 27.—שה, to which singular (or noun of unity), צאן (flock) corresponds as a plural (or collective noun), is a sheep or goat, and requires therefore additional description, if either of the two species is particularly meant; therefore ver. 5, "Your lamb .. you shall take it from the sheep or from the goats" (see Deut. xiv. 4). An instructive instance of the relation between שה and צאן, is Exod. xxi 37: "If one steal a sheep (שה), he shall restore four sheep" (ארבע צאן). A similar connection exists be-

fathers' house, a lamb for a house. 4. And if the house*hold* be too little for a lamb, let him and his neighbour next to his house take one according to the number of the souls; you shall count for the lamb *every* man according to his

tween שור, an ox, and בקר, a herd (of oxen). Compare 2 Chron. xxxv. 7—*They shall take for themselves every man a lamb for a father's house, a lamb for a house.* This is a simple distributive number: every father's house shall take one lamb; the second time, בית is, for the sake of brevity, used instead of בית אבת, with the more propriety, as both expressions are in this sense frequently identical. See note to vi. 14, where it will also be seen, that בית אבת "a fathers' house" is a portion of a משפחה or family, so that it might in some cases consist of too few members to consume a lamb (ver. 4). We can, therefore, not accede to the opinion of Clericus and Rosenmüller, who take בית אבת for a whole *family*, and the succeeding בית differently, as an individual *house*, so that the sense would be: "If the family (or בית אבת) consist of too few members, they shall take one lamb or kid; but if it be too numerous, every house shall have one for itself" (similarly also Ebn Ezra). Against this interpretation militates: 1) The *sense*; for in combination with the next verse, it would yield the following illogical connection: every family shall take a lamb; or if one house of this family is numerous enough, let it take a lamb for itself; now, if this house is too small for a lamb, it shall associate itself with its neighbour. Would it not rather follow, that it should remain with its *family?* and 2) The *form*; for that elliptical and complicated sense attributed to שה לבית, would at least require the conjunction ו before it, as it would stand in the disjunctive sense to the preceding words; especially if we compare the explicit manner, in which the other possibility is expressed in the next verse (ואם ימעט הבית מהיות משה).

4. *And if the household be too little for a lamb;* thus also Luther ("wo ihrer aber in einem Hause zum Lamm zu wenig sind"), and Mendelssohn, ("Ist aber die Haushaltung zu gering Gaeste eines Lammes zu sein"); more distinctly still translates the Sept.: (Ἐὰν δὲ ὀλιγοστοὶ ὦσιν οἱ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, ὥστε μὴ ἱκανοὺς εἶναι εἰς πρόβατον); and Vulgate, ("Sin autem minor est numerus ut sufficere possit ad vescendum agnum"). And this sense is rendered by almost all other translators. But Jonathan, in his paraphrastical manner, introduces a traditionary element, rendering: "if, however, the men of the house are less than ten," in accordance with the rabbinical axiom, that solemn actions, especially prayers, are to be performed by an assembly of at least ten Israelites, because the presence of God prefers to dwell among such assembly, since that number represents the whole community of Israel. And so we have here again the notion of the *unity* symbolized by the rites of Passover, which is still more evident from the following passage of Josephus (Bell. Jud. VI. ix. 3): "they slay the paschal-lamb from the ninth hour to the eleventh, but so that a company of not less than ten belong to every sacrifice (for it is not lawful for them to feast singly by themselves), and many of us are twenty in a company." But although such assembly was considered desirable, it was not indispensable; and Targum Jonathan remarks on our verses "the number of the members of the family may be less than ten; if it is only sufficient to consume the lamb."—The female part of the community was also admitted to the paschal-lamb, but according to rabbinical regulation, the *obligation* to do so devolved on the men alone (See *supra*, p. 183). But the Karaites permitted only adult male persons to participate of it.—According to Joma xii. 1, foreign Israelites, who came to Jerusalem to cele-

נַפְשֹׁת אִישׁ לְפִי אָכְלוֹ תָּכֹסּוּ עַל־הַשֶּׂה׃ 5 שֶׂה תָמִים זָכָר
בֶּן־שָׁנָה יִהְיֶה לָכֶם מִן־הַכְּבָשִׂים וּמִן־הָעִזִּים תִּקָּחוּ׃ 6 וְהָיָה
לָכֶם לְמִשְׁמֶרֶת עַד אַרְבָּעָה עָשָׂר יוֹם לַחֹדֶשׁ הַזֶּה וְשָׁחֲטוּ אֹתוֹ

brate the Passover, were accommodated with the necessary apartments gratuitously, but were obliged to leave to their hosts the skin of the paschal-lamb, and the vessels they had used in their religious ceremonies. However, as the circumference of Jerusalem was little more than one league, and as the number of the Israelitish visitors on Passover was exceedingly great (at the Passover of 65, A.C., there were in Jerusalem three millions of Jews; *Josephus*, Bell. Jud. II. xiv. 3): it was impossible to lodge them all in houses; and it is probable that most of the pious guests lived during their stay in tents around the town, as to this time the Mohammedan pilgrims around Mecca (compare notes on xxiii. 14—17).—*Let him and his neighbours* (ושכנו) *next to his house take one.*—This is undoubtedly the correct interpretation, adopted by many expositors, whilst the Septuagint, Vulgate, and Rosenmüller render: *let him take also his neighbour next to his house*, understanding ו in ושכנו in the sense of *also*; which signification is, however, questionable.—במכסת נפשת *according to the number of the souls.* מִכְסָה, feminine of מֶכֶס, from כסס (like מַר, from מרר), originally, *to number*, (from which verb is the following תָּכֹסּוּ), then to tax (therefore מֶכֶס tribute). Arnheim makes the following deduction: כסס, zaehlen, zahlen, zollen, beisteuern. Gesenius (Thes. p. 702) brings כסס into connection with קצץ, to divide, to distribute, and considers מַס as a contraction from מֶכֶס. See, however, note on i. 11. The Septuagint renders correctly ἀριθμός, and so the Vulgate, numerus; Targum Onkelos, מנין; Targum Jonathan, סכום; Rashi, חשבון; but Ebn Ezra less distinctly חלק, portion.—*You shall count for the lamb every man according to his eating*, that is, you shall, in selecting the guests and fixing their numbers, be guided by the usual measure or amount of their eating, so that the lamb may be likely to suffice for them; or, as Gesenius expresses it: "vel plures vel pauciores ad agnum comedendum admittatis, prout hi vel multum vel parum comedunt, ut infantes, senes, aegroti" (Thes. p. 702). Septuagint: "ἕκαστος τὸ ἀρκοῦν αὐτῷ."—According to the rabbinical interpretation every Israelite was to eat of the paschal-lamb a piece at least as large as an olive (כזית); those who were unable to eat that quantity, as children and aged persons, were not counted among the number of guests.

5. The paschal-lamb was to be: 1. *perfect*, faultless, without blemish (תמים Sept. τέλειον; Vulg. absque macula; Targ. שלים; Ebn Ezra and Rashi בלא מום), in accordance with the general precept concerning sacrifices in Levit. xxii. 20: "Whatsoever hath a blemish, that you shall not offer; for it shall not be acceptable for you;" 2. *male* (זכר) in harmony with the general notion of antiquity, that the males are superior to females; and, therefore, more appropriate for offerings to the Most High (See Lev. xxii. 19), and 3. *one year old* (בן שנה), that is, a lamb, which is within the first year from its birth, and has not yet attained its second year. This tender age, the type of innocence, made it peculiarly adapted for a sacrifice of the covenant to be concluded between God and Israel as a nation or a political community. About the Hebraism בן שנה see note on iv. 10, ad איש דברים.—*You shall take it from the sheep or from the goats* (ומן העזים); either from the one or from the other, for שה comprises עז also (see on ver. 3); ו before מן is, therefore, disjunctive *or*, as in xxi. 15, 17, etc. The Targumin, the Septuagint, Luther, and others translate literally *and*; which, however, does not exclude the same *meaning.*

eating. 5. Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male, one year old; you shall take *it* from the sheep or from the goats: 6. And you shall keep it until the fourteenth day of the same month; and the whole assembly of the con-

The Vulgate renders: "juxta quem ritum tolletis et haedum," i.e. besides a sheep you may also take a goat; which expresses again the same sense, with the difference, that the preference seems to be given to the sheep, in want of which only a goat was to be offered. And, in this respect, observes Bochart (Hieroz. i lib. 2, cap. 50, p. 664): "I think that the pious used this liberty (of offering either a lamb or a kid) so that they chose the lamb with predilection, as the sacrifice more acceptable to God, because its gentleness, docility, and innocence is greater. And this is also the reason why the lamb was even by heathen nations considered as the most sacred sacrifice" (compare supra, p. 182).

6. משמרת custody, guard; the lamb shall be kept by you till the fourteenth day; and the whole assembly of the congregration of Israel shall kill it בין הערבים, literally: *between the two evenings*. The principal opinions, which have been proposed about this obscure phrase are: 1. Onkelos renders בין שמשיא "between the two suns," which Talmudical expression signifies the space of time between the setting of the sun and the moment when the stars become visible (between six and seven o'clock), an interval sufficient for an ordinary walker to go half a league (see Talmud, Sabb. xxxiv. b; compare *Bochart*, Hieroz. i. 634, who explains these words differently, but less in accordance with the Talmudical exposition). The same opinion has been more distinctly expressed by Ebn Ezra: "We have two evenings; the first, the setting of the sun, that is, the time when he disappears beneath the horizon; and the second, the ceasing of the light which is reflected in the clouds; and between both lies an interval of about one hour and twenty minutes;" and this explanation, which appears to be the most rational interpretation of the words בין הערבים, is also that of the Karaites (see *Trigland*. de Karæis, cap. 4), and the Samaritans (*Reland*, de Sam. diss. miscell. § 22), and has been adopted by Frisch, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Maurer and others. The Arabians have the same idiom in the same sense: "the time between the two evenings," i.e. between the beginning of darkness and the perfect setting of the sun. The Septuagint renders πρὸς ἑσπέραν, and Vulgate, "ad vesperam," which translations, although not clear, do not exclude the same interpretation. 2. Saadiah, who questions the possibility that the whole congregation of Israel could, within the short space of one hour and twenty minutes, sprinkle the blood on the altar of the temple, observes: "It was a tradition, that the people began to kill the lamb from the moment when it was evident that the sun declined towards the west; and our text mentions the time 'between the two evenings,' because the greater part of the paschal-lambs were then killed; and the disappearance of the light of the sun was the last point for the performance of that rite." This is also the opinion of Rashi, who remarks: "from noon and upwards is called בין הערבים, which expression embraces, therefore, the hours from the commencement of the lengthening shadows to the beginning of the night;" which explanation coincides with that of Kimchi, and has been adopted by Philippson (who says, clearly, that בין הערבים is *afternoon*) and others. But we must urge against it: *a*) the words בין הערבים, "between the two evenings," which have no etymological or internal connection with "the time after noon;" and *b*) the passage Deut. xvi. 6, where it is commanded to kill the paschal-lamb: "in the evening, when the sun goes down, the time when

כל קהל עדת־ישראל בין הערבים׃ 7 ולקחו מן־הדם ונתנו
על־שתי המזוזת ועל־המשקוף על הבתים אשר־יאכלו אתו בהם׃
8 ואכלו את־הבשר בלילה הזה צלי־אש ומצות על־מררים

thou didst depart from Egypt" (compare vers. 31 and 42 of our chapter), evidently with reference to, and in harmony with, our verse. From the same reasons, 3) the opinion of others (as Ralbag), is still less admissible, that בין הערבים means, "the moment at noon when the sun begins to verge towards west." According to Exodus xxix. 31, 39, 41, the evening sacrifice was to be offered בין הערבים, which cannot have been ordered to take place at noon. 4) The traditional acceptation, adopted by the Pharisees and the Talmudists (Pesach., 61 *a*) and acted upon in the service of the temple was, that the "first evening" is the time in the afternoon, when the heat of the sun begins to decrease about three o'clock; and that the "second evening" commences with sunset. Thus writes Josephus (Bell. Jud. VI. ix. 3): "The Passover festival took place, for which they sacrifice from the ninth to the eleventh hour," i. e. between three and five P.M. This opinion is defended by Bochart, who compares with it "the two evenings" of the Greeks, the *δείλη πρωΐα* and *δείλη ὀψία*; the one is, *ἡ μετ' ἄριστον ὥρα*, the other, *ἡ περὶ δύσιν ἡλίου*. It is, however, not impossible, that although בין הערבים means, originally, the time at dusk, as described by Ebn Ezra, it was later, at the actual service of the temple, found impracticable to perform the increasing number of sacrifices in such limited space of time, and that it was, therefore, gradually extended from an earlier hour in the afternoon; but no doubt the later part was preferred, as more in accordance with the literal injunction of the law, as is evident from the remark of Saadiah above quoted. The translation of the English Version *in the evening*, is too indistinct. Hitzig's opinion, that "the two evenings" are the hours before and after sunset, and "between the two evenings," therefore, the precise moment of sunset, since the fourteenth of Nisan was likewise a Sabbath, on which it was unlawful to make the preparations even for the paschal-lamb, can scarcely be seriously entertained; as that expression recurs on many other occasions, undoubtedly in no connection with the Sabbath (Num. xxviii. 4; Exod. xxx. 8, etc.), and the one minute which separates both days was certainly insufficient for the preparation and killing of the paschal-lamb; and admitted even, that the fourteenth of Nisan was, in the year of the exodus, a Sabbath, it was not so in all the subsequent years.—We call particular attention to the fact, that every Israelite (כל קהל עדת ישראל), not the priests and Levites alone, were allowed to kill the paschal-lamb, as if thus manifestly to show, for the first time, that they were all equally sacred before their God, although later the Levites took a prominent part in these solemn sacrifices; see 2 Chron. xxx. 7, xxxv. 5, etc. (so observes *Philo*, Opp. ii. 169: *Ἐν ᾗ ἑορτῇ οὐχ οἱ μὲν ἰδιῶται προςάγουσι τῷ βωμῷ τὰ ἱερεῖα, θύουσι δ' οἱ ἱερεῖς, ἀλλὰ νόμου προςτάξει σύμπαν τὸ ἔθνος ἱερᾶται τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἑκάστου τὰς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ θυσίας ἀνάγοντες τότε καὶ χειρουργοῦντες*. See supra, p. 181).

7. *And they shall take of the blood*, etc. מזוזה, from זוז to move, the door-posts, "upon which the hinges turn." Not so undisputed is the meaning of משקף. It appears to be derived from שקף in the sense "to cover with planks or beams;" and signifies *lintel* (limen portæ superioris, *Oberschwelle*), and thus it is taken by almost all modern philologists. The Septuagint renders *φλία*, which is, according to Hesychius, *πρόθυρον*, vestibulum. Rashi derives it from the Chaldee word שקף *to beat*, "because the door, in being shut, beats against it." Others connect it with שקף, *to look* (in Niph. and Hiph.

gregation of Israel shall kill it [1]at dusk. 7. And they shall take of the blood, and strike *it* on the two side-posts and on the lintel of the houses wherein they will eat it. 8. And they shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire, and unleavened bread; with bitter *herbs* they shall

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—In the evening.

Judges v. 28; Ps. xiv. 2); thus Ebn Ezra explains it by *window;* "for," says he, "the Arabians have windows over the doors of their houses;" and Bochart observes, that it was so called on account of the grates and railings over the tops of the doors, through which those who desire entrance into the house could be seen, before they were admitted. Polybius calls such doors θύρας διαφανεῖς δικτύωτας; Paulinus, *pellucentem transennam*, and Cassiodorus, *tralucidas fores.*—Passover was the festival of initiation; the paschal-lamb the initiatory sacrifice; the blood is the soul, the life of the animal; the house is the representative of the family; the door-posts are the most prominent part of the house; they are that which leads into the house. Thus the deep significance of the extraordinary command here enjoined is obvious. The blood of the national sacrifice was visibly marked on the abodes of the Israelites; it atoned for the families who lived therein; it made them worthy to enter the sacred covenant; it was thus at the same time a pledge of help and life. Thus this ceremony served for the following purposes: *a*) It was after the departure of the Israelites, a proof to the Egyptians that the Lord had, in the midst of their own universal pestilence, protected and delivered His people. *b*) It was a symbolical sign, in accordance with the general figurative phraseology, which is used in connection with this plague; ver. 12: "For I will pass through the land of Egypt;" and ver. 13: "and when I see the blood I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you;" and analogous to the redeeming sign (תו) which Ezekiel (ix. 4) mentions in the description of a vision concerning a similar calamity. Hence appears the impropriety of the conjecture, that that command was given to the Israelites in order to show to the Egyptians publicly, that they dared freely to kill their sacred, inviolable animals. The rites connected with Passover are too holy, too significant, to be used merely in opposition to the absurdest forms of idolatry; they have all a comprehensive, and deep, positive value; they do not require the adventitious support of negative relations.

8, 9. The paschal-lamb was to be eaten in that night, 1. roasted with fire; and 2. roasted *entirely*, with its head, its legs, and its purtenance; but neither raw, nor sodden with water.

1. The principal reason why the lamb was not to be cooked but roasted, was the precipitancy with which the Israelites left Egypt, and which did not allow them leisure for a more careful preparation of the meal. A variety of other, mostly artificial reasons (for instance, that eating roasted meat is the custom of free and illustrious men; that roasting with fire produces *uniformity* in the arrangements; that it excluded certain pagan rites; that it is the cleanest mode of preparing meat, etc.), has been collected by Spencer (de Leg. Hebr. rituall. lib. ii. c. 4, Sect. 3; compare *Hottinger*, Jus Hebr. p. 23). More plausible appears the explanation of Baehr (Symb. ii. p. 636), that the mere roasting of the lamb by the fire shows the Hebrews as leaving their settled abodes, as entering upon the struggle and combat of their wanderings as "the army of God," for it was especially the custom of soldiers to eat meat hastily roasted by the fire. But he urges the words "in all the *armies* (צבאות) of the Lord" too much; צבאות is here, as frequently, the *hosts*, the

יֹאכְלֻהוּ׃ 9 אַל־תֹּאכְלוּ מִמֶּנּוּ נָא וּבָשֵׁל מְבֻשָּׁל בַּמָּיִם כִּי אִם־

numbers, comprising the whole people. If boiling the meat causes "not much more delay" than roasting, it occasions certainly *some* delay; and it was all-important that the people should, at a moment's notice, be ready to commence their journey. According to Rashi, the entrails were first taken out, cleaned, and then put again into their original place (see, however, *infra*, the extract from Belon). The prohibition, that the meat should not be eaten נָא, i.e. raw (Sept. *ὠμόν*, so also *Ebn Ezra*), was not superfluous, because even at present eastern travellers (as *Burckhardt*) have found persons eating the raw flesh of killed animals, without any preparation or dressing. Besides, נָא signifies also meat which is not sufficiently done, half done. Targum Onk. and Jonathan render נא by כד חי, "while still living;" and here we may observe, that, according to Herodotus and Plutarch, several heathen nations, at their barbarous and idolatrous sacrifices in honour of Bacchus, which have their origin in Egypt, used to tear off parts from the living animals, and to consume the raw and palpitating limbs. However, *a*) we need not to suppose the Israelites to have inclined to this savage custom; and *b*) בשר חי means simply row meat (1 Sam. ii. 15); and we consider, therefore, the former explanation more correct. —The lamb was, further, not to be cooked in water, because this would make the dismemberment of the animal indispensable. The expression in Deut. xvi. 7, "thou shalt cook (ובשלת) and eat the paschal-lamb" receives its proper explanation by 2 Chron. xxxv. 13: "and they *roasted* the paschal-lamb in fire (ויבשלו .. באש) as it is right," so that בשל alone signifies any preparation of meat by means of fire; as the ancient translators render in this latter passage: *they roasted*. בָּשֵׁל is a noun: *something boiled or sodden*, of which the feminine בְּשֵׁלָה occurs in Numb. vi. 19; the following words מבשל במים are, therefore, the qualification of בשל, "sodden in *water*."

2. We have already above alluded to the probable reason why the lamb was to be roasted entirely with all its members and parts, none of which was to be broken (vers. 4, 6); this rite served to represent the perfect unity of Israel as a nation, and thus to symbolize their political existence now to be established by their exit from Egypt, and sealed by that sacrifice of covenant between God and the people. All who partook of that undivided sacrifice should consider themselves as an undivided community. Those who were assembled for the paschal meal, whether they belonged to the same or to different families, represented, in a smaller compass, the whole people; and that assembly again, by seeing the whole lamb before them undissected and intact, was naturally and forcibly reminded of its unity with their absent brethren, and of the national significance of the whole festival.—Some illustration of several precepts connected with the paschal-lamb might also be furnished by the following observation of Layard (Discoveries, p. 287): "A sheep was always slain for the guests; . . . . if there were not strangers enough to consume the whole, the rest was given to the workmen or to the needy, as it is considered derogatory to the character of a truly hospitable and generous man to keep meat until the following day . . . . Even the poorest Bedouin who kills a sheep invites all his friends and neighbours to the repast, and if there be still any remnants, distributes them amongst the poor and the hungry, although he should himself want on the morrow."—על כרעיו וכ׳ *with* its legs, etc. על has sometimes the signification of עם, *together with*, for instance, Numb. ix. 11; Deut. xvi. 3. It might, in our countries, appear a difficult task, to bring a whole lamb well roasted on the table. But, in the Orient it is not unfrequent to roast entire lambs and sheep. Belon narrates (b. i. c. 60): "At the end of the bridge we met with shepherds, roasting entire sheep, to sell them to travellers; the en-

eat it. 9. Eat not of it raw, nor sodden with water, but roast *with* fire; its head with its legs, and with the

trails had been taken out and the body again sewed together. Those who have not seen it can scarcely imagine how commodiously such a mass of flesh can be roasted." About other methods of roasting sheep, customary in the East, see Thevenot, Trav. ii. p. 236.

This roasted paschal-lamb is to be eaten with מצות and מררים. The word מצה, derived from מצץ, to suck out, or to be sweet ("because those things that are sweet and pleasant to the taste are often sucked;" Gesen.), signifies sweet, unfermented bread; Septuagint, ἄζυμα; Vulgate, azymi panes. Kindred with these meanings is that of being *pure*, free from all unclean substances. And thus it is evident that the מצות had a double symbolical meaning: 1. They were ordered in commemoration of the sufferings under which the Israelites sighed in Egypt; and are, therefore, called לחם עני, "bread of affliction," Deut. xvi. 3; and no more appropriate emblem of that long misery could be selected than that "poor, unpalatable bread," consisting only of flour and water. Thus the use of unleavened bread was to remind the Israelites of their *past* oppression; it was to keep alive a grateful remembrance of the miraculous redemption from the tyrannical yoke which they had borne for centuries. But, 2, they represent purity and sanctity; they point forward to the *future* glory of Israel, to its vocation as a nation of priests, as a community of sanctity and religious life. They are thus intended to fill their minds with a deep feeling of the sublime mission for which the Eternal had graciously destined them; they are the spiritual bread, which *is* life and *spreads* life. Unleavened bread was later used at the public meat-offerings (Exod. xxix. 2; Lev. ii. 4, 5, 11, etc.); for leaven was prepared by letting dough, mixed with water, lie for some days, till it fermented; and is, therefore, considered as a kind of corrupted substance, incompatible with the sanctity of sacrifices. "Leaven," says Plutarch, "comes from corruption and corrupts the dough with which it is mixed, and every fermentation seems to be a putrefaction." And Gellius observes: "To touch flour mixed with leaven was not allowed to the priest of Jupiter" (Noct. Att. x. 13, 19). Every leaven was to be removed from the houses; the Israelites were to separate themselves from sin, and impurity, and corruption; for only with purified minds and divine thoughts they could become the teachers of nations; and this was the great end which Providence pursued in releasing them from their ignominious bondage. And thus the two ideas contained in פסח and מצות converge, in their internal essence, to the same point (see on ver. 13, and p. 180; compare Deut. xiv. 2; vii. 6—8). It is well known that, in accordance with these notions, the Rabbins frequently compared the good instinct of man (יצר הטוב) with unleavened bread, whilst they metaphorically compared the evil propensity (יצר הרע) with leaven.—The law does not fix the species of corn from which the מצות were to be baked; tradition, however, supplying this deficiency, permits the flour of wheat, barley, spelt, and oats (Pesach. ii. 5). Some suppose that they were first baked from barley, as that grain which men used in the very earliest time for their food. "Among the Bedouins and Kabyles, as soon as the dough is kneaded it is made into thin cakes, either to be baked immediately upon the coals, or else in a shallow earthen vessel like a frying-pan, called Tajen" (*Paxton*, Illustr. of Script i. p. 369; compare note on ver. 39). About unleavened bread in general see *Ewald*, Jurnal für Oriental. Wissensch. iii. 423.

Bitter herbs (מררים) symbolising the bitterness of bondage, with which the Israelites were tormented (Compare Ps. lxix. 22; Jer. viii. 14), are rendered by the Septuagint, πικρίδες (wild lettuce endive); Vulgate, lactucae agrestes,

צְלִי־אֵשׁ רֹאשׁוֹ עַל־כְּרָעָיו וְעַל־קִרְבּוֹ׃ 10 וְלֹא־תוֹתִירוּ מִמֶּנּוּ עַד־בֹּקֶר
וְהַנֹּתָר מִמֶּנּוּ עַד־בֹּקֶר בָּאֵשׁ תִּשְׂרֹפוּ׃ 11 וְכָכָה תֹּאכְלוּ אֹתוֹ מָתְנֵיכֶם
חֲגֻרִים נַעֲלֵיכֶם בְּרַגְלֵיכֶם וּמַקֶּלְכֶם בְּיֶדְכֶם וַאֲכַלְתֶּם אֹתוֹ בְּחִפָּזוֹן פֶּסַח
הוּא לַיהוָה׃ 12 וְעָבַרְתִּי בְאֶרֶץ־מִצְרַיִם בַּלַּיְלָה הַזֶּה וְהִכֵּיתִי
כָל־בְּכוֹר בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מֵאָדָם וְעַד־בְּהֵמָה וּבְכָל־אֱלֹהֵי מִצְרַיִם

which are, according to Niebuhr, still used by the Jews in Egypt and Arabia on the first evenings of Passover. The Talmud (Pesach. 39 a) enumerates five species: עולשין, תמכא, חרחבינא, מרור and חזרת, which Bochart (Hieroz. i. 692) explains as "lactuca sativa, intybum, parthenium, urtica, and lactuca sylvestris or intybum sylvestre." Targum Onkelos mentions in our verse two of these five kinds, namely תמכא and עולשין.—According to a remark in Ebn Ezra's commentary, it was very general in Egypt to eat bitter herbs to all meals, even to bread alone, for the purpose of digestion, which in that country suffers much on account of the heaviness and dampness of the air. But even if such custom really prevailed, and if, therefore, the use of bitter herbs were superfluously enjoined, that external custom received, under the circumstances of our context, a new typical meaning and a higher signification; for the whole festival of Passover symbolises the perfect and eternal separation between Israel and Egypt (xiv. 13); and in a cycle of ordinances so specifically spiritual, we shall scarcely expect to find any dietary prescription.

10. Macrobius (Saturn. ii. 2) relates that the heathens, previously to their undertaking a journey, were accustomed to offer a sacrifice, which was called *propter viam* (because it was intended to secure a prosperous journey), and to eat the *whole* of it, if possible; but if any part was left, to burn it with fire. Herodotus (i. 132) narrates, that the Persians used to look upon the remnants of their sacrifices with superstitious veneration, and in order to prevent a similar abuse, to which the Israelites, in their idolatrous disposition, might then have inclined, the precept of burning the unconsumed parts of the paschal-lamb was, according to Rosenmüller and others, enjoined. That command might, however, have originated in exactly the reverse motive, namely to preclude portions of the sacred meal being afterwards thrown disrespectfully away, contrary to its solemn destination; an apprehension, which was especially well-founded at the hasty celebration of the first Passover in Egypt, and which might also have suggested the command, not to take any part of the paschal-lamb out of the house; but to consume it there with religious devotion (ver. 46). Annihilating by fire was by all antiquity considered as the purest and most purifying process.—The Sept. translates ולא תותירו intransitively: Οὐκ ἀπολείψεται (and thus the Vulgate: nec remanebit); and adds, after the first part of the verse, the words: *καὶ ὀστοῦν οὐ συντρίψετε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*, from ver. 46, ועצם לא תשברו בו.—As the probable number of persons sufficient to consume a lamb, was fixed beforehand (ver. 4), Ebn Ezra explains the possibility of a remnant by supposing the case, that the company included an invalid, who cannot eat his portion; and Targum Jonathan expresses the rabbinical interpretation of the words: "and that which is left of it till the morning, you shall burn with fire," rendering: "and that which remains over of it you shall keep till the morning, and burn on the *sixteenth* day of Nisan; for it is not right to burn the rest of a holy sacrifice on a festive and sacred day." This interpretation leans on the repetition of the words עד בקר in

purtenance thereof. 10. And you shall not leave anything of it until the morning; and that which is left of it until the morning you shall burn with fire. 11. And thus shall you eat it: *with* your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your stick in your hand; and you shall eat it in haste: it is a [1]Pesach to the Lord. 12. For I shall pass through the land of Egypt this night, and shall smite all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both man and beast; and against all the gods of Egypt I shall execute

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Passover.

our verse, in which tradition found *two successive mornings* after the evening of the fourteenth day.

11. The paschal-lamb was to be consumed by the Israelites completely prepared for their departure; namely: 1. *Their loins girded;* for as the Orientals wear long and loose robes, they fastened them on their journeys round their waist, with a strong girdle, generally of leather (compare 2 Kings iv. 29; ix. 1. Jeremiah i. 17, etc.). 2. *Their shoes on their feet;* for they wore shoes or sandals on their travels (Josh. ix. 5, 13), but not in their houses. See our note on iii. 5. 3. *Their sticks in their hands;* for sticks are not only useful but necessary for travellers in the sandy desert; and 4. *in haste* (בחפזון from חפז, to leap or spring up, then to flee with haste, and then simply to make haste; 2 Sam. iv. 4), like wanderers, and in order to be able to commence their journey immediately after having *finished* the meal, which was to be considered as a sign of the new sacred covenant between God and Israel. The haste was to increase the solemnity of the act, excluding, as it did, every luxurious effeminacy. These observances were to be solemnised, because *it is a Pesach to the Lord,* פסח הוא ליי', i.e., a paschal sacrifice in honour of the Lord (Mendelssohn: "es ist das Ueberschreitungsopfer, dem Ewigen zu Ehren"). About the signification of פסח see supr., p. 181, and it will be obvious, that it is here taken in its original and limited meaning of *paschal-lamb*, perfectly synonymous with זבח פסח הוא ליי', in ver. 27. פסח ליי' is a construction analagous to חג ליי', שבת ליי' (ver. 14), a Sabbath or festival in honour of the Lord.—Targum Jonathan renders the beginning of our verse: "and with these rites you shall consume the lamb this time, but not in future generations," which is self-evident; and Ebn Ezra says pointedly against those, who yet recommended the observance of the same ceremonies in later times: "they are all wandering in their minds! let them also annually on the fifteenth of Nisan go out of their land in commemoration of the exodus from Egypt."

12. About ועברתי, see note on xi. 4. The power of God will fearfully manifest itself in the land; His majesty will create terror; His justice will produce awe and veneration—and *thus* he will pass through the land.—*And against all the gods of Egypt I shall execute judgment:* which words evidently mean, that the uniform and general extirpation of all the firstborn of the Egyptians, which calamity their gods will be powerless to avert, will be a manifest proof to those, who have hitherto worshipped them, that they are a vain support and an idle refuge: thus the authority of the idols will be destroyed in the eyes of the Egyptians, and this was the severest "judgment," which the omnipotent Lord of the Universe (אני יי') could exercise against them. The rabbinical interpretation of that phrase has again been expressed by Targum Jonathan: "Against all the idols of Egypt I shall execute four judgments: the idols

אֶעֱשֶׂה שְׁפָטִים אֲנִי יְהוָה׃ 13 וְהָיָה הַדָּם לָכֶם לְאֹת עַל הַבָּתִּים
אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם שָׁם וְרָאִיתִי אֶת־הַדָּם וּפָסַחְתִּי עֲלֵכֶם וְלֹא־יִהְיֶה בָכֶם
נֶגֶף לְמַשְׁחִית בְּהַכֹּתִי בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 14 וְהָיָה הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה לָכֶם
לְזִכָּרוֹן וְחַגֹּתֶם אֹתוֹ חַג לַיהוָה לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם חֻקַּת עוֹלָם תְּחָגֻּהוּ׃
15 שִׁבְעַת יָמִים מַצּוֹת תֹּאכֵלוּ אַךְ בַּיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן תַּשְׁבִּיתוּ שְּׂאֹר
מִבָּתֵּיכֶם כִּי כָּל־אֹכֵל חָמֵץ וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהִוא מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל

made of metals shall melt, those of stone shall be overthrown, those of clay shall be smashed, and those of wood shall crumble into dust, that the Egyptians may know, that I am the Lord."—Similarly explains Ebn Ezra: "All the gods of Egypt will be smitten by the same fate which befell *Dagon*, the idol of the Philistines, whose head was broken off and fell down, when the ark of the Israelites was brought into his temple" (see 1 Sam. v. 3, 4). Others, as J. D. Michaelis, take our verse still more literally: "That many of the firstborn animals, which would also die, were among the Egyptian deities" (see note to viii. 22); but the emphatical expression: "that *all* the gods of the Egyptians would experience the might of the Lord," does not allow us to limit that punishment to the animal deities alone. The translation of those who render אלהי מצרים "the mighty of Egypt," seems quite improbable; and the alteration or Houbigant, who proposes to read אהלי instead of אלהי, is both arbitrary and unnecessary.

13. לכם, *for you*, in your favour.—וראיתי, "and *when* I see;" see note on iii. 13, ad ואמרו.—פסח is construed with על, like all verbs of saving, protecting, as גנן, חמל, חוס, etc. פסח, has here also the double signification of *passing over* and *saving*, and thus translates Onkelos, ואיחוס, "I shall save;" Rashi, וחמלתי, "I shall pity;" Sept. more freely, σκεπάσω ὑμᾶς, "I will shield you." In ver. 27, פסח is synonymous with הציל; in Isa. xxxi. 5, with גנון and המליט. The word διαβατήρια, which occurs in Philo (Vit. Mos. iii. 686), and Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. vii. 32), signifies the sacrifice for the successful progress of a journey or expedition, not the transit of the sun into the sign of Aries (see *supra*, p. 184). משחית, originally destroyer, here taken as an abstract noun, *destruction*. Participles, if used as nouns, have, not unfrequently, an abstract meaning, as מְרֻדָּף, persecution (Isa. xiv. 6), מֻצָּב, a station (Isa. xxix. 3), etc. The Septuagint renders here נגף למשחית, πληγὴ τοῦ ἐκτριβῆναι, Vulgate, plaga disperdens, a destroying plague; see on ver. 23.

14. After the precepts concerning the Passover in Egypt had been communicated to Moses, till ver. 13, the observances for its future celebration are now enjoined to him from ver. 14 to 20 (see p. 187).—חג ליי׳, see on ver. 11. (חג הפסח, or חג המצות; πάσχα, ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων, or τὰ ἄζυμα). חג, from חגג = חוג, to dance, as, anciently, dances formed one of the favourite amusements on festive occasions. Philippson remarks: "Albu (Ikkarim, iii. 16) dilates largely upon the term חקת עולם, and he is of opinion, that עולם is also applied to a limited time, and does not necessarily signify eternity. So in Prov. xxii. 28; Isa. xlv. 17; Exod. xxi. 6 (where a service till the jubilee is called an eternal one), [but this passage is of disputed meaning, see our note on it]; xxvii. 21; Levit. xxiv. 3." It is, however, evident, that a similar restriction is not contained in the precept of our verse, and that it was certainly the intention of the legislator to enjoin the celebration of Passover for all futurity. Such alterations in its rites as became necessary, in conse-

judgment: I the Eternal. 13. And the blood shall be to you for a sign upon the houses where you *are:* and when I see the blood, I shall pass over you, and the plague will not be upon you as a [1]destruction, when I smite the land of Egypt. 14. And this day shall be to you as a memorial; and you shall celebrate it *as* a feast to the Lord through your generations; you shall celebrate it *as* an ordinance for ever. 15. Seven days shall you eat unleavened bread; even the first day you shall remove the leaven out of your houses: for whosoever eateth [2]anything leavened from the first day to the seventh day, that soul

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—To destroy you. [2] Leavened bread.

quence of the destruction of the temple (see p. 182), are no deviation from the precepts, but their observance, according to their *spirit;* and it is these modifications only, in which the festival, as at present observed, differs from the commands contained in our chapter.

15. *Seven days shall you eat unleavened bread.* This command can, as Ebn Ezra remarks, only refer to the future Passovers, as the first time, at the departure from Egypt, they were only, by the pressing events, precluded from letting the dough ferment, as appears from ver. 39, see *supra*, p. 183. In commemoration of this circumstance, however, the use of unleavened bread during seven days was ordered; and this precept is already here inserted, although it had its origin in, and was given after, a later event. The contradiction between our passage, and Deut. xvi. 8: "Six days thou shalt eat unleavened bread, and on the seventh day *shall be* a holy (concluding) assembly to the Lord thy God," is only in appearance, as the seventh day shall, besides the eating of unleavened bread, which it has in common with the whole festival, be distinguished by a final convocation.—*Even the first day you shall remove leaven out of your houses.* As, according to xxiii. 18, the paschal-lamb was not to be offered when leavened bread (חמץ) was still in the houses and as it was to be killed towards the evening of the fourteenth day of Nisan (ver. 6): the Rabbins have ordered the removal of the leaven on this day, and they render the words: ביום הראשון תשביתו שאר, "on the first day *you shall have removed* the leaven," similar to Gen. ii. 2: "on the seventh day *God had completed* (ויכל) His work." The ancient interpreters understand תשביתו in accordance with the rabbinical explanation; the modern translators render it partly as a futurum exactum (Mendelssohn, Salomon, Philippson, and others), partly as a simple futurum (De Wette, Zunz, Arnheim, and others), Rosenmüller leaves it undecided. If, indeed, during an interval of full seven days unleavened bread was interdicted, it is natural, that, as a measure of precaution, all leaven was to be removed before the first day, that is on the fourteenth day of Nisan. שְׂאֹר, from שְׂאֹר = שִׂיר, to boil up, ferment (German, *sauer* sein), fermentation, leaven. חָמֵץ (from חָמֵץ, to be sharp, sour), anything *leavened* (see *Gesenius*, Thes. under both roots). From these etymological significations, it is evident that שאר is not eatable, but causing fermentation if mixed with dough, whilst חמץ is, or may be eatable. Therefore is שאר originally and properly identical with מחמצת, "that which leavens" (ver. 19), but in our text שאר, and חמץ, and מחמצת, appear to be used promiscuously (compare vers. 19, 20).—But he who eats

מִיּוֹם הָרִאשֹׁן עַד־יוֹם הַשְּׁבִעִי׃ 16 וּבַיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ
וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ יִהְיֶה לָכֶם כָּל־מְלָאכָה לֹא־יֵעָשֶׂה
בָהֶם אַךְ אֲשֶׁר יֵאָכֵל לְכָל־נֶפֶשׁ הוּא לְבַדּוֹ יֵעָשֶׂה לָכֶם׃
17 וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת־הַמַּצּוֹת כִּי בְּעֶצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה הוֹצֵאתִי אֶת־
צִבְאוֹתֵיכֶם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת־הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם
חֻקַּת עוֹלָם׃ 18 בָּרִאשֹׁן בְּאַרְבָּעָה עָשָׂר יוֹם לַחֹדֶשׁ בָּעֶרֶב תֹּאכְלוּ
מַצֹּת עַד יוֹם הָאֶחָד וְעֶשְׂרִים לַחֹדֶשׁ בָּעָרֶב׃ 19 שִׁבְעַת יָמִים
שְׂאֹר לֹא יִמָּצֵא בְּבָתֵּיכֶם כִּי ׀ כָּל־אֹכֵל מַחְמֶצֶת וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ

leavened bread during these seven days, *that soul shall be cut off from Israel*, that is, those who neglect the precepts connected with this covenant between God and Israel, cease, thereby, to be members of that privileged community (מֵעֲדַת יִשְׂרָאֵל, ver. 19), exactly as the *personal* relation between God and those who neglect the circumcision is severed by such disregard, see p. 179. The order of the words כי כל אכל, to the end of the verse, is rather unusual; for, 1st. כל אכל חמץ is to be connected with מיום הראשון 'וכ; and, 2nd. to enhance the emphasis of this severe menace, the subject כל is repeated, but with a substantive (הנפש ההוא), which points to the spiritual character of this rigorous injunction.

16. On the first day on which the exodus took place, there shall be a holy convocation (מקרא קדש), and so also on the seventh day, in commemoration of the passage through the Red Sea, and the destruction of the Egyptian army. From Levit. xxiii. 2, it is obvious, that מקרא קדש, and מועד, are almost synonymous, but so, that מועד is rather the wider notion. Now מוֹעֵד (from יעד, to fix, to appoint) is *an appointed time*, then a festival; whilst מקרא (from קרא, to call) is a festival which was announced by the holy trumpets, and for which, therefore, the people was *assembled* or *called together* (πανήγυρις). See Num. x. 2, 10; compare Levit. xxiii. In the East, and chiefly among the Mohammedans, the festivals and popular assemblies are still announced by heralds, from conspicuous places, especially the towers of the temples. The Septuagint renders: *καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ πρώτη κληθήσεται ἁγία*, "the first day shall be called holy," as if the Hebrew text were: ויום הראשון יִקָּרֵא (נִקְרָא) קדש, whilst it translates the words מקרא קדש, the second time with *κλητὴ ἁγία*. The same liberty and discrepancy occur in the rendering of the Vulgate: "Dies prima erit sancta atque solemnis, et dies septima eadem festivitate memorabilis."—כל מלאכה לא יעשה, *all* work shall *not* be done, that is, *no* work, *not any* work. Compare x. 15.

17. *And you shall observe the feast of unleavened bread*, (את המצות), that is, you shall take care to eat, on that day, unleavened bread, as a commemoration. Ebn Ezra, Rashi and others, interpret these words literally: "you shall watch the unleavened cakes lest they ferment;" which idea would stand in no connection with the reason immediately following: "for on this day have I brought you out of Egypt." The Samaritan Version has the easier, and, therefore, suspicious reading: המצוה, *the command*, instead of המצות, and so translates the Septuagint: *τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην*.—*For on this selfsame day have I brought* (הוצאתי) *your hosts out of the land of Egypt.* The Septuagint renders the verb in the future, *ἐξάξω*, and so the Vulgate, educam: "I shall bring out;"

shall be cut off from Israel. 16. And on the first day *there shall be* a holy convocation, and on the seventh day there shall be a holy convocation to you; no work shall be done on them, save *that* which is to be eaten by every man, that only may be done by you. 17. And you shall observe *the feast of* unleavened bread; for on this selfsame day have I brought your hosts out of the land of Egypt: therefore shall you observe this day throughout your generations *as* an ordinance for ever. 18. In the first *month*, on the fourteenth day of the month, in the evening, you shall eat unleavened bread, until the one-and-twentieth day of the month in the evening. 19. Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your houses; for whosoever eateth that which is leavened, even that soul shall be cut off from the congregation of Israel, whether

evidently because the exodus has not yet been related. But although the precepts concerning the unleavened bread were given *after* the exit, they are, in our text, systematically and logically connected with the other regulations and observances concerning Passover; see note on ver. 15. We need, therefore, not to take here הוצאתי (with Mendelssohn, Cahen, Glaire and others) as a futurum exactum: "I shall have brought out."

18. בראשן *in the first*, scil. *month* (compare Ezra i. 1, etc.).

19. Those who eat anything leavened during those seven days, shall be cut off, *both the stranger and the native of the land*. אזרח (from זרח, to shoot forth with א prostheticum), one who is born in a country, a *native*. The Hebrew law distinguishes two kinds of strangers: 1. *The proselytes of justice* (גרי צדק), who have, by the rite of circumcision, been received in the covenant of Abraham, and who have, therefore, in every respect, the same duties and the same rights as born Israelites; and 2. *The strangers of the gate* (גרי שער) who, without having undergone that first ceremony of the Abrahamic covenant, have pledged themselves to keep aloof from idolatry, and to observe the so-called seven laws of Noah (enumerated on xxii. 20); they were only tolerated members of the state (גרים תושבים), without enjoying any religious privilege. It is scarcely necessary to add, that the perfect parity established in our verse (and in verse 49) between the native Israelite and the stranger, applies only to the first class, the proselytes of justice; although the other strangers also, who lived in the Hebrew cities, were bound, as a precautionary measure, to abstain from leavened food during the seven days of Passover. *Natives of the land* are those who are born from Israelitish parents, although these might themselves have been proselytes, natives of another country or belonging to another nation and a different creed. Not quite correct is therefore the opinion of Clericus, who believes that the *natives of the land* were the direct descendants of Abraham, "because they are the progeny of Isaac and Jacob who were born in Canaan, which land they had received by God as their perpetual abode." The strangers of the gate cannot be strictly included in this command, as the expression: "that their soul shall be cut off from the congregation of Israel"—to which they do not belong—cannot be applied to them. — About the further

הַהִוא מֵעֲדַת יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּגֵּר וּבְאֶזְרַח הָאָרֶץ׃ 20 כָּל־מַחְמֶצֶת לֹא
תֹאכֵלוּ בְּכֹל מוֹשְׁבֹתֵיכֶם תֹּאכְלוּ מַצּוֹת׃ פ חמישי
21 וַיִּקְרָא מֹשֶׁה לְכָל־זִקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם מִשְׁכוּ וּקְחוּ לָכֶם
צֹאן לְמִשְׁפְּחֹתֵיכֶם וְשַׁחֲטוּ הַפָּסַח׃ 22 וּלְקַחְתֶּם אֲגֻדַּת אֵזוֹב
וּטְבַלְתֶּם בַּדָּם אֲשֶׁר־בַּסַּף וְהִגַּעְתֶּם אֶל־הַמַּשְׁקוֹף וְאֶל־שְׁתֵּי הַמְּזוּזֹת
מִן־הַדָּם אֲשֶׁר בַּסָּף וְאַתֶּם לֹא תֵצְאוּ אִישׁ מִפֶּתַח־בֵּיתוֹ עַד־בֹּקֶר׃

relation between גר and תושב, see note on xxii. 20.

20. *In all your habitations*, that is, according to tradition, even out of Palestine (חוץ לארץ), where the paschal-lamb is not offered.

21. Moses communicates now (ver. 21—28) to the elders, and through them to the people of Israel (see note to iii. 16), the law concerning the paschal-lamb; but our text contains rather the general sense than the exact words, which Moses used on this occasion, in order to avoid a monotonous repetition. Therefore צאן is here briefly said instead of כבש and עז (ver. 5), הפסח, the paschal-lamb, is merely mentioned, whilst the explanation, by which alone that expression becomes intelligible, follows later in ver. 23; and the use of the hyssop in the evening of the fourteenth day of Nisan for the purpose of marking the door-posts is here for the first time ordered, whilst it is not mentioned in the preceding part of our chapter. The time, when the lamb is to be chosen, the number of guests, the manner in which the lamb is to be eaten, and the precept concerning that which might be left over to the following morning—all this is here omitted from the reason assigned.—*Draw out and take for yourselves a lamb.* משך, as in Arabic, to draw, then simply to take, so that משכו and קחו are nearly synonymous, and we can neither accede to the explanation of Rashi, that משכו refers to those who possess cattle, and have only to take the lamb from the folds, and קחו to those who possess none, and have to buy the lamb; nor to the opinion of those, who (like De Dieu) give to משך the doubtful interpretation of *going*: "go and take you a lamb" (so also the Septuagint: Ἀπελθόντες λάβετε; and Vulgate: Ite tollentes. Compare ii. 1). Jonathan renders instead of משכו: "take your hands away from the idols of the Egyptians."

22. *And you shall take a bunch of hyssop.* אֲגֻדָּה (from אגד, to bind) a bunch, which according to tradition (Talm. Pesach. xi. *b*) consists of three stalks; and according to Maimonides (Per. Aboth. 3) of "as much as a man can hold in one hand."—Hyssop was almost by all ancient nations considered to possess a purifying power, and was therefore frequently used for the holy ceremonies (*Pliny*, Hist. Nat. xxvi. 15; *Porphyr.* Abstin. iv. 6). Bunches were also extensively applied for lustrations and sprinklings; the Greeks used for these purposes one formed of the boughs of the olive-tree or laurel, called θαλλός (*Virgil*, Æn. vi. 230; *Ovid*, Fast. iv. 728).—But the exact species of אזוב is uncertain. It is rendered by the Sept., ὕσσωπος; the Vulgate, hyssopus; the Targumim, איזובא; the Syrian, זובא; but by Saadiah, Sahtar; and the Talmud (Sabb. 109 b, 128 a; Chul. 62 b; Succah 13 a) asserts distinctly, that the Hebrews did not coincide with the Greeks in fixing the species expressed by אזוב. Now the hyssop is in 1 Kings v. 13, described as "coming forth from, or growing on, the wall," in opposition to the lofty cedar of the Lebanon. This would well agree with the *hyssopus officinalis*, which has small pointed leaves,

he be a stranger, or born in the land. 20. You shall eat nothing leavened; in all your habitations you shall eat unleavened bread.

21. Then Moses called for all the elders of Israel, and said to them, Draw out and take for yourselves a lamb according to your families, and kill the [1]Pesach. 22. And you shall take a bunch of hyssop, and dip *it* in the blood that *is* in the basin; and none of you shall go out from the

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Passover.

about one inch long and rather hard; ramifying stalks, about one inch and a half high; and blue or white blossoms, which appear from June to August, and furnish the bees with ample honey-stuff. For sprinklings, for which it is ordered here and for other holy ceremonies (Lev. xiv. 4, 6, 51. Num. xix. 18. Ps. li. 9), it is well adapted; for it has small, numerous, tender, and slightly villous leaves, which when dipped in water or blood, easily imbibe the fluid, and when softly shaken give it forth again. It grows almost in natural bunches, for a single root produces a great number of suckers. But the plant *Sahtar*, which Saadiah, Maimonides, and others who follow the Jewish tradition, mention as אזוב, belongs to the species of Origanum, which is very usual in Palestine and near Mount Sinai, an aromatic plant, with a strong straight stalk, one foot high, many villous leaves and white blossoms; and it grows on stony soil, dust-hills, and similar places.—As Origanum resembles the hyssop very much (*Plin.* xx. 6, 7), the discrepancy between Jewish tradition and the old translators is easily accountable; but as in ritual matters tradition is the safest authority, we are inclined to understand אזוב rather as a species of Origanum than as Hyssopus officinalis, although the former might have included the latter also. The monks of Mount Sinai identify the plant *Dshahdah* with Hyssop. See *Bochart*, Hieroz. i, 587—593; *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. II. xv. 4; *Faber*, Analect. Theol. I. i. *et seq.*; and the travellers: *Hasselquist*, p. 554; *Robinson*, i. 180, and others.—*And you shall dip it (the hyssop) in the blood that is in the basin* (סף). This word סף means here basin, as in 2 Sam. xvii. 28; 1 Kings vii. 50; 2 Kings xii. 14, etc.; and so it has been taken by Onkelos, Jonathan, Rashi, and several modern interpreters. But the more usual signification of סף is "threshhold," as in Judg. xix. 27; 1 Kings xiv. 17, etc; and so translate the Septuagint (*ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ παρὰ τὴν θύραν*), Vulgate (in sanguine, qui est in limine); Ebn Ezra and Rosenmüller leave it undecided. However, the supposition on which this interpretation is based, that the paschal-lamb was killed on the threshold of the house, has little probability, and is in itself forced and artificial.—The reason why "nobody should go out from the door of the house until the morning" is obvious. According to tradition this command was given, lest the destroying angel, who made no difference between the righteous and the wicked, might attack and kill them. Clericus remarks: "lest some Egyptians suspect that their countrymen may have been killed by the Israelites." But our text calls this night ליל שמורים, "a night of watching" (ver. 42), a time of a solemn and religious sanctity; it was to be spent at home with devotion and pious reflections calculated to impress the mind of the Israelites with the high importance of that critical period, the manifold and arduous duties they undertook by the new covenant entered into with the God of their ancestors and the numerous trials, which

23 וְעָבַר יְהוָה לִנְגֹּף אֶת־מִצְרַיִם וְרָאָה אֶת־הַדָּם עַל־הַמַּשְׁקוֹף
וְעַל שְׁתֵּי הַמְּזוּזֹת וּפָסַח יְהוָה עַל־הַפֶּתַח וְלֹא יִתֵּן הַמַּשְׁחִית
לָבֹא אֶל־בָּתֵּיכֶם לִנְגֹּף׃ 24 וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה לְחָק־לְךָ
וּלְבָנֶיךָ עַד־עוֹלָם׃ 25 וְהָיָה כִּי־תָבֹאוּ אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר יִתֵּן יְהוָה
לָכֶם כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֵּר וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת־הָעֲבֹדָה הַזֹּאת׃ 26 וְהָיָה כִּי־
יֹאמְרוּ אֲלֵיכֶם בְּנֵיכֶם מָה הָעֲבֹדָה הַזֹּאת לָכֶם׃ 27 וַאֲמַרְתֶּם
זֶבַח־פֶּסַח הוּא לַיהוָה אֲשֶׁר פָּסַח עַל־בָּתֵּי בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמִצְרַיִם
בְּנָגְפּוֹ אֶת־מִצְרַיִם וְאֶת־בָּתֵּינוּ הִצִּיל וַיִּקֹּד הָעָם וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ׃
28 וַיֵּלְכוּ וַיַּעֲשׂוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן
כֵּן עָשׂוּ׃ ס ששי 29 וַיְהִי ׀ בַּחֲצִי
הַלַּיְלָה וַיהוָה הִכָּה כָל־בְּכוֹר בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִבְּכֹר פַּרְעֹה הַיֹּשֵׁב

awaited them in following His guidance through the trackless desert.

23. *And He will not suffer the destruction* (המשחית) *to come into your houses to smite you* (לנגף); this is perfectly the same idea as expressed in ver. 13, with the words: ולא יהיה בכם נגף למשחית, and משחית is, in both passages, *destruction*, not *destroyer*. The ancient, and many of the modern translators have, indeed, here *destroyer* (Onkelos מחבלא, Septuagint ὀλοθρεύοντα, Vulgate "percussorem," etc.); but not one of them has thereby, like Targum Jonathan and Clericus, understood the *destroying angel*, who executes the plague under the command and direction of God, so that משחית would be identical with מלאך המשחית, in 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, or one of the משלחת מלאכי רעים "legatio angelorum calamitatum" (Ps. lxxviii. 49.) Where we have, however, such clear analogy as the 13th verse offers, it is unnecessary to recur to notions of the angelology, dating only from a very late period of Israel's history. ולא יתן *and He will not allow, suffer*. Compare iii. 19.

24. *And you shall observe this thing.* It would appear from the context (see vers. 23—27), that the eternal observance here enjoined refers to the marking of the door-posts with the blood of the paschal-lamb (see p. 183); however, the traditional Jewish interpretation has applied it to the general precepts concerning Passover, and limited that ceremony only to that one Passover in Egypt.

25. It is evident, from this verse, that the complete rites of Passover, especially the offering of the paschal-lamb, were only to be observed in the holy land, except one Passover, which was celebrated in the desert in the second year after the exodus, on the especial command of God (Numb. ix. 1—5).—ושמרתם the apodosis introduced by ו.—עבדה *service*, religious rite or ceremony.

26, 27. The many unusual and striking observances of Passover will induce the children to enquire after their origin and meaning; and, by the detailed information which the parents are expected to offer them upon those national subjects, the memory of the great and miraculous events will annually be revived, and operate every year as a renewal of the political covenant between God and Israel. In the service for the two first evenings of Passover, as at present performed, this command has found its en-

door of his house until the morning. 23. For the Lord
will pass through to smite Egypt; and when He seeth the
blood upon the lintel, and on the two side-posts, the Lord
will pass over the door, and will not suffer the destruction
to come into your houses to smite *you*. 24. And you
shall observe this thing for an ordinance to thee and to
thy children for ever. 25. And it shall come to pass,
when you are come to the land which the Lord will give
you, as He hath spoken, that you shall keep this service.
26. And it will come to pass, when your children will
say to you, What do you *mean by* this service? 27. That
you shall say, It *is* the sacrifice of the Lord's Pesach, who
passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt,
when He smote Egypt, and delivered our houses. And
the people bowed their heads and prostrated themselves.
28. And the children of Israel went away, and did as the
Lord had commanded Moses and Aaron, so did they.
29. And it came to pass, that at midnight the Lord
smote all the firstborn of the land of Egypt, from the

tire and solemn realisation. About פסח see on vers. 11, 13. The infinitive בנגפו changes in the next part of the sentence into the verb finite הציל, for the preposition (ב) necessarily affects only the verb to which it is joined; if other verbs follow, they stand in that mood and form which the sense requires; and this is chiefly the case if the verb follows the substantive, as here ואת בתינו הציל. Compare Isaiah xiii. 9. The reverse case, that is, the transition of the verb finite into the infinitive, has been noticed in our note on viii. 11.

28. The people, who had by a series of amazing wonders become irresistibly impressed with the omnipotence of God, believed now unreservedly in His faithful messenger, through whom He had performed all these miracles, and with humble submission (ver. 27), they executed all the preparations which had been prescribed to them.

TENTH PLAGUE—DEATH OF THE FIRST-BORN OF EGYPT. Verses 29—33.

29. In spite of the repeated exhortations of Moses, Pharaoh persevered in his obduracy; and thus the last and most fearful of all plagues, which had been threatened at least five or six days before it took place (see ver. 3), became inevitable. It is natural to suppose a pestilence as the basis of this infliction; and, indeed, such fatalities are not unusual in Egypt during the months of March and April, about the season of the exodus of the Israelites. The pestilence in Egypt is generally a concomitant of hot, oppressive winds; and, as the *darkness*, which constituted the ninth plague, was produced, or at least attended by, such infesting storms, especially the Chamsin (see note on x. 21), the succession of these two calamities is founded on the natural and usual phenomena of Egypt. Minutoli (p. 224), remarks: "Pestilence appears in Kairo usually at the end of March or the beginning of April. The miasm is spread by contagion. But local

עַל־כִּסְאוֹ עַד בְּכוֹר הַשְּׁבִי אֲשֶׁר בְּבֵית הַבּוֹר וְכֹל בְּכוֹר בְּהֵמָה :
30 וַיָּקָם פַּרְעֹה לַיְלָה הוּא וְכָל־עֲבָדָיו וְכָל־מִצְרַיִם וַתְּהִי צְעָקָה
גְדֹלָה בְּמִצְרָיִם כִּי־אֵין בַּיִת אֲשֶׁר אֵין־שָׁם מֵת : 31 וַיִּקְרָא לְמֹשֶׁה
וּלְאַהֲרֹן לַיְלָה וַיֹּאמֶר קוּמוּ צְּאוּ מִתּוֹךְ עַמִּי גַּם־אַתֶּם גַּם־בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל וּלְכוּ עִבְדוּ אֶת־יְהוָה כְּדַבֶּרְכֶם : 32 גַּם־צֹאנְכֶם גַּם־
בְּקַרְכֶם קְחוּ כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתֶּם וָלֵכוּ וּבֵרַכְתֶּם גַּם־אֹתִי : 33 וַתֶּחֱזַק
מִצְרַיִם עַל־הָעָם לְמַהֵר לְשַׁלְּחָם מִן־הָאָרֶץ כִּי אָמְרוּ כֻּלָּנוּ מֵתִים :

peculiarities may increase its fatal character, and even the prevailing winds are of important influence upon its progress; if the Chamsin blows, the plague increases to a fearful degree and destroys its victims rapidly." The Arabs are accustomed, at the cessation of the Chamsin, to congratulate each other on having survived that period; so ordinarily is that wind accompanied by pestilential diseases. Nor is the exemption of certain portions of the population from the effects of the calamity, without parallel or analogy. Michaud (vii. p. 29) remarks: "The Bedouins are generally very sober and abstemious; they have no physicians and few diseases; the *eye-pestilence*, which ravages so frequently and destructively in Egypt, is almost unknown to them; and the plague seldom appears among them." (See *Prokesch*, Erinnerungen, ii. p. 244). However, the following are the miraculous features in our narration: 1. That the pestilence breaks out exactly in the night predicted by Moses; 2. that it rages in that night only; 3. that only the *first-born* die; 4. that the first-born of the cattle are also destroyed; and 5. that the Israelites are entirely free from the influence of the plague. This extraordinary character of the calamity excludes the merely natural interpretation of Eichhorn (de anno Æg. mirabili, p. 62), that the fetid exhalation of a certain river (Caleg) causes an enormous mortality among the children of those who live near it, and who, therefore, at such periods, remove from its vicinity. But, according to our text, the plague was in *all* parts of Egypt, nor did the children die promiscuously, but only the first-born.—We trust that the uninterrupted climax in the ten inflictions has been sufficiently pointed out, to let the opinion of N. H. Wessely (on Aboth v. 6) "that two severe plagues alternated regularly with one of a less formidable character," at once appear as perfectly unfounded. The mercy of God gave to Pharaoh ample time for repentance. 1. By the signs which preceded the plagues. 2. By the interval between one chastisement and the following; and 3. By the warning announcement which preceded seven of these inflictions. Pauses in the course of the tragic struggle of Pharaoh would, therefore, have been both untimely and unavailing. The seventy-eighth Psalm (ver. 43, *et seq.*), in which but six plagues are mentioned, cannot possibly be adduced as a proof to the contrary; poetical specification is widely different from minute historical narration; a proof of which is the irregularity with which those six plagues are enumerated; the order is so little preserved, that it is obvious, the Psalmist intended merely to offer a general, though emphatical description of God's greatness displayed in favour of His people.—About בחצי הלילה see note on xi. 4; and about בכור מצרים on xiv. 5.—שְׁבִי *captive* (from שבה to lead away captive).—בית הבור (as Jer. xxxvii. 16), properly "the house of a pit or cistern," or, as empty cisterns were frequently used as prisons, dungeon-house or *dungeon*. Compare Gen. xl. 15; Jer.

firstborn of Pharaoh who sat on his throne, to the firstborn of the captive who *was* in the dungeon; and all the firstborn of cattle. 30. And Pharaoh rose up in the night, he, and all his servants, and all the Egyptians, and there was a great cry in Egypt; for *there was* not a house where *there was* not one dead. 31. And he called for Moses and Aaron *in the* night, and said, Arise, go out from among my people, both you and the children of Israel; and go, serve the Lord, as you have said. 32. Also take your flocks and your herds, as you have said, and go; and bless me also. 33. And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people, to send them out of the land in haste; for they

xxxviii. 6; Zech. ix. 11.—*And all the first-born of cattle died.* The animals were included in the general destruction on account of the sacredness with which they were regarded by the Egyptians; their sudden annihilation added, therefore, religious grief and mortification to the personal sufferings caused by the death of the nearest relatives (compare note on xi. 6).

30. *For there was not a house where there was not one dead.* The history of the fearful punishments inflicted upon Pharaoh and his subjects is narrated with such emphasis and even tragical pathos, that we cannot be surprised if a poetical hyperbole is sometimes employed to indicate the force and energy with which the inspired writer felt the enormity of those calamities (comp. ix. 18, 24; x. 14, etc.). If, therefore, there was not in *every* family a first-born son, to be made a victim of death, it is sufficient that the vast majority of the Egyptian houses contained a fearful, though silent witness of divine judgment (see note on ix. 6). But questionable is Rashi's remark (adopted by Calmet, Clarke and others), "that the first-born was smitten in those families where there was one; whilst in the other houses the eldest and most respected individual was destroyed." Although sometimes the most influential individual is called בכור (Ps. lxxxix. 27; compare Exod. iv. 22); the repeated phrase "the first-born of man and the first-born of *beast*," excludes a figurative acceptation.

31. *And he called*, namely Pharaoh, which the Septuagint adds.—כדברכם = כאשר דברתם in ver. 32, as you *have* said. See x. 9, 24, 25.

32. The refractoriness of Pharaoh was at last broken, and not only did he allow the departure of the Israelites with their wives, children and cattle, but he added the humiliating request: וברכתם גם אתי, that is, "pray for me also, when you sacrifice, that the Lord may avert further calamities from me and my people;" so that the words of Moses (x. 25): "Thou must give us also sacrifices, that we may sacrifice to the Lord our God," are almost literally verified. The proud king is compelled to entreat for the blessing of those who had hitherto been to him objects of contempt and aversion; so perfect was the victory of the Lord over the obstinacy of the monarch.

33. *And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people.* חזק is construed with על, which preposition is frequently used to denote *pressure* or *heaviness*; compare 2 Sam. xv. 33 (היית עלי למשא); xviii. 11; therefore קצף על, to be angry against somebody.—מצרים (feminine), instead of המצריים; Septuagint, κατεβιάζοντο οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι; Vulgate, Urgebantque Ægyptii.—*For they said, We are all dead men*; Targum Jonathan and Jerusalem translate: "If the Israelites stay

34 וַיִּשָּׂא הָעָם אֶת־בְּצֵקוֹ טֶרֶם יֶחְמָץ מִשְׁאֲרֹתָם צְרֻרֹת בְּשִׂמְלֹתָם
עַל־שִׁכְמָם׃ 35 וּבְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל עָשׂוּ כִּדְבַר מֹשֶׁה וַיִּשְׁאֲלוּ מִמִּצְרַיִם
כְּלֵי־כֶסֶף וּכְלֵי זָהָב וּשְׂמָלֹת׃ 36 וַיהוָה נָתַן אֶת־חֵן הָעָם בְּעֵינֵי
מִצְרַיִם וַיַּשְׁאִלוּם וַיְנַצְּלוּ אֶת־מִצְרָיִם׃ פ
37 וַיִּסְעוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵרַעְמְסֵס סֻכֹּתָה כְּשֵׁשׁ־מֵאוֹת אֶלֶף רַגְלִי

here one hour longer, we shall all be dead." These words cannot include an apprehension on the part of the Egyptians, that this plague might be sent to destroy all Egyptians, since Moses had clearly stated to Pharaoh, that only the first-born would be struck by the pestilence (xi. 5). Nor can this passage be brought into connection with v. 3: "lest He fall upon us with pestilence," in which words, Ebn Ezra believes, the Egyptians are also included, so that the latter now fear the realization of this menace; see, however, our note on v. 3. The Egyptians urged the Israelites to depart, because they feared another still more fearful plague, which might kill them all, accustomed as they were to a steady gradation in the dispensations of divine justice.

34. בצק (from בצק, to swell up), *dough*, "so called from its swelling up, although used of the lump also, before it is leavened" (*Gesenius*), and therefore the Vulgate renders: "conspersa farina."—טרם יחמץ, *before it* (the dough) *was leavened*. טרם, usually an adverb, is here applied as a conjunction, like בטרם, as in Josh. iii. 1; Isa. lxv. 24. Maurer, who takes טרם here also as an adverb, is obliged to translate: "which (dough) was not yet leavened;" but the pronoun relative is generally only omitted in the *accusative* case.—משארתם צררת, is a Nominativus absolutus: "their kneading-troughs being bound up." על שכמם, is to be connected with וישא העם. About the meaning and derivation of משארת, kneading-trough, see note on vii. 28. But this word has, in our verse, received different other interpretations: 1st. The *dough*, so renders the Septuagint, *τὰ φυράματα αὐτῶν*; and Kimchi explains, "the dough itself," deriving it from שאר, food, Exod. xxi. 10; Luther, "zu ihrer *Speise*." 2nd. *The remains*; thus Targum Jonathan ("that which was left to them from the unleavened bread and the bitter herbs," see ver. 8); Targ. Jerusalem and Rashi. However, the two other passages where that noun occurs (Exod. vii. 28, and Deut. xxviii. 5) exclude any other interpretation but that of kneading-troughs.—As the Israelites bound their kneading-troughs in their clothes, and took them upon their shoulders, we must understand these troughs to have been rather small and light, perhaps similar to the utensils which the Arabians still use for kneading the dough of their unleavened cakes, and which are merely small wooden bowls, in which the cakes are also preserved. The Hebrew word משארת (says Harmar, ii. p. 453) may, perhaps, signify a kind of leather utensil, which the Arabs still apply, spreading it, at times, as a table-cloth, but occasionally tying it up into a bag, and using it for carrying their victuals, especially their dough (De Wette, Backschüsseln).—Large kneading-troughs are, indeed, unnecessary in the East, as every family daily bakes the necessary quantity. The thin bread cakes would scarcely preserve themselves for a longer time; they soon become perfectly dry, and are, therefore, mostly eaten fresh. The shape and use of the garments in which the Hebrews carried their troughs upon their shoulders, may be easily imagined after the analogy of the dress at present common among the Bedouins of Asia and Africa, and known under the name of *Haik*. It resembles the *toga* of the Romans, and

said, We *are* all dead *men*. 34. And the people took their dough before it was leavened, their kneading-vessels being bound up in their clothes, upon their shoulders. 35. And the children of Israel did according to the word of Moses; and they [1]asked of the Egyptians [2]articles of silver, and articles of gold, and raiment. 36. And the Lord gave the people favour in the eyes of the Egyptians; and [3]they gave them gladly. And they plundered Egypt.

37. And the children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, about six hundred thousand men on foot,

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Borrowed. [2] Jewels. [3] They lent unto them *such things as they required.*

the *peplum* of the Greeks. Its wide folds above the shoulder make it a useful and appropriate receptacle for all kinds of portable things. A description of the Haik will be found in the note on xxii. 26. See *Arvieux*, i. 69, iii. 227; *Tavernier*, ii. 280; *Harmar*, i. 223; *Rosenmüller*, Orient, i. 303. About ovens, and the preparation of unleavened bread, compare notes on vii. 27, and xii. 8, 39.

35, 36. We refer to our note on iii. 22, only remarking, with regard to the Hiphil form וישאלום peculiar to our text, that as שאל is, to ask, השאיל means to cause or induce to ask, that is, to give willingly and gladly. Thus says Hannah (1 Sam. i. 27, 28): "For this boy have I prayed (התפללתי), and the Lord has given me my desire (שְׁאֵלָתִי) which I have desired (שָׁאַלְתִּי) of Him. And so will I give him (השאלתיהו) to the Lord all the days of his life." Thus, further explains Rashi: "They gave them even what they did not ask; they said: 'You wish one thing, take two and go!'" The usual interpretation, therefore, of *lending*, which the Septuagint and Vulgate (*καὶ ἔχρησαν αὐτοῖς*; ut commodarent eis) have first introduced, is perfectly as objectionable as the rendering of שאל, in iii. 22, by *borrowing*. We add the following analogous passage from Tacitus (Germ. xxi): "On the departure of a guest, it is the custom to present him with whatever he may ask for; and with the same freedom a boon is desired in return. They are pleased with presents, *but think no obligation incurred either when they give or receive.*"

37. *And the children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth.* That Rameses רַעְמְסֵס is a *province*, most probably identical with Goshen, has been remarked on I. 11, to which we refer. The rendering of Targum Jonathan, "from Pelusium," is, therefore, incorrect. It is, however, still more probable to suppose one town than a whole province to have been the place of general meeting; for such a vast number of emigrants required a centre; and the whole plan was no doubt carefully preconcerted, in all its details, among the whole Hebrew population. We believe, therefore, that although Rameses is the whole province of Goshen, they took their departure from a principal town of that district, perhaps Raamses, where they assembled during the general confusion and consternation of the Egyptians caused by the death-spreading pestilence.—The place, which formed the first station of the Israelites after their departure, is here called סכות, i. e., tents or booths. Nomads give this name frequently to the places of their temporary encampments (as, for instance, Jacob did in Gen. xxxiii. 17, etc.); and it appears from the context, that that station was already called so previous to the Exodus of the Israelites, and that it must have been known as an appropriate locality for pitching the tents of a great number

הַגְּבָרִים לְבַד מִטָּף׃ 38 וְגַם־עֵרֶב רַב עָלָה אִתָּם וְצֹאן וּבָקָר

of travellers. — Tradition has fixed the distance between Rameses and Succoth at 40 parasangs or 120 miles; evidently an exaggerated statement, if we consider that it was the journey of one night.— It is impossible now to determine the exact situation of this Succoth; the list in Num. xxxiii. 5, 6, affords no clue; and Josephus does not even mention the same or a similar name, writing thus on the departure of the Israelites (Antiq. II. xv. 1): "So the Hebrews went out of Egypt.... Now they took their journey by Letopolis, a place at that time deserted, but where Babylon was built afterwards, when Cambyses laid Egypt waste," which is improbable, as Babylon was situated in the south of Old Kairo.—Philippson, coinciding with the Pictorial Bible, proposes the following conjecture: "From xiv. 2, it is evident that the Israelites did not at first proceed to the Red Sea, as they afterwards *turned round* (וישבו) to arrive there. According to the position of the places they could, therefore, first only go up to the isthmus of Suez (at the borders of the desert, xiii. 20), consequently to north-east. The course was probably nearly that which is now taken by the pilgrim caravans from Kairo to Mecca, which is not directly eastward, but first by north-east, and then by east, in order to round the 'Arabian mountain' of Herodotus, which, in the east, shuts in the valley of the Nile. On this route, at a distance of about 12 miles N.N.E. from the present Kairo, lies a place, which is very convenient for an encampment, and where the great pilgrim caravan from Kairo to Mecca awaits the arrival of the western pilgrims previous to its final departure. This is, with much probability, thought to be the Succoth of the text. At this place there is a rather large lake, called Birket-el-Hadj (Pilgrim's Pool), which receives its waters from the Nile, and near which there are several small villages, with country houses and date-plantations belonging to the principal inhabitants of Kairo."—But 1. It is difficult to reconcile this supposition with the statement of Josephus, above quoted; for Babylon, which, in the time of Cambyses, was founded at the place of Letopolis, is situated to the *south*, and not to the *north* of Goshen; 2. The Israelites did, in fact, not travel *north*-eastwards, but *south*-eastwards; in order to reach the Red Sea from Goshen—and in this direction lies Succoth; but as they had gone *too far* southwards, they *returned* (xiv. 2) to the north, until they arrived nearer to the northern extremity of the gulf of Suez, where the passage was practicable (see note on xiv. 2). Kitto himself, in his History of Palestine (I. p. 176), abandons that supposition, believing that, "Succoth must be sought somewhere about a day's journey in the direction towards Suez." Compare *Pococke*, Orient, p. 233; *Shaw*, Trav. p. 267; *Niebuhr*, Descript. of Arab. p. 407. The conjecture of Osburn, who identifies Succoth with Xois in the centre of the Delta, is as untenable as his supposition concerning the situation of Rameses (see note on v. 1).— *They went out about six hundred thousand men on foot* (רגלי הגברים), i. e., men capable of bearing arms, or as Rashi observes, above twenty years of age (compare Num. i. 3); *besides the children*, "under twenty years" (*Ebn Ezra*).—600,000 men above twenty years (according to Num. i. 46, more accurately 603,550, and 22,000 Levites) justify us in supposing the whole population of the Israelites, including women, children, and servants, to have consisted of at least two and a half million of souls; for the males above twenty years of age are about one half of the total male population; and the females might be put down to the same number. A similar proportion is stated by Cæsar (Bell. Gall. i. 29) concerning the Helvetii, who numbered 92,000 men capable of bearing arms, whilst their whole population, "including children, old men, and women," amounted to 368,000 souls, or exactly four times the former number.—But it has often

besides the children. 38. And a mixed multitude went up also with them, and flocks, and herds, very much

been found questionable, if not impossible, that the seventy souls, who immigrated into Egypt in the time of Jacob, should, during their sojourn there, have increased to such a great nation. To explain this apparent difficulty, we remind the reader of the following facts and arguments: 1. Among the Hebrews, like the other Eastern nations, polygamy was the rule; 2. They married early, as it is still customary in the East to enter the conjugal life in the thirteenth or fourteenth year; 3. They lived longer, and attained no doubt in the average to an age above ninety years; 4. "By a singular providence of God they were not weakened by pestilence or famine" (*Rosenmüller*); 5. The prodigious fruitfulness of the Hebrews in Egypt is expressly mentioned in i. 7 (where we have quoted similar statements from other ancient writers); 6. The period which elapsed between the immigration of Jacob and the Exodus amounts to 430 years (see Introduction, § 2). Now, if we take a generation to extend about thirty years, and suppose that in the average every man had no more than three sons, the sixty-nine souls (excluding Jacob), trebled in thirty years; this number was again increased to the three-fold amount in other thirty years; and in fourteen generations they would, after this calculation, amount to about thirty-three millions; and, therefore, no reasonable critic will find the number of two and a half millions impossible or exaggerated; even irrespective of the opinion of Philo (II. p. 210), that the circumcision enhances the fruitfulness (τὰ τεμνόμενα τῶν ἐθνῶν πολυγονώτατα καὶ πολυανθρωπότατα εἶναι). Thus the curious supposition of Bauer (Hebr. Hist. I. 268), "that only on their journey at the other side of the Red Sea, a large number of Israelites living in Arabia, joined the stock and general mass of the people [which is against our text] and made up that number"; further, the opinion of Vater, "that the ערב רב which accompanied the people (ver. 38) is included in that number," and several other conjectures require no further comment. — The singular increase of the Hebrews must astonish us the less, if we consider that the land of Canaan, which was but very thinly populated at the time of the emigration of Jacob's family, became, during their sojourn in Egypt, a most populous country, and Jost observes correctly: "the increase of the Israelites since they left Canaan, stands in proportion with the increase of those, who occupied it during that time."—We refer the reader further to the authentic and interesting account concerning the Englishman Pine, who was, in the year 1589, by a shipwreck, thrown, with four females, upon a deserted island south-east of the Cape of Good Hope, and whose descendants had, after seventy-eight years (in 1667) increased to more than 11,000 souls.—About the question, how this vast number could, during forty years, find food for themselves and their cattle in the barren and dreary wilderness, which had at the same time to support many other Arab tribes, we refer to our note on xvi. 2.

38. *And a mixed multitude went up also with them.* ערב (from ערב, to mix), a mixture, a large troop, or multitude, which is, in Numb. xi. 4, called אספסוף (from אסף, to gather, collect), a mixed crowd. If we compare our passage with Nehem. xiii. 3, it is clear that ערב is the mass of strangers, Non-Israelites, who joined them on leaving Egypt, and who were by no means a desirable class of associates, as appears from Numb. xi. 4, 5. As the new dynasty, which invaded Lower Egypt, and subdued it (see note on i. 8), no doubt included the native Egyptians in the tyrannical oppression inflicted upon the Israelites, since the same reasons of policy existed for paralysing the energy of both races (see note on i. 10), many Egyptians, most likely, eagerly seized the opportunity of freeing

מִקְנֶה כָּבֵד מְאֹד׃ 39 וַיֹּאפוּ אֶת־הַבָּצֵק אֲשֶׁר הוֹצִיאוּ מִמִּצְרַיִם
עֻגֹת מַצּוֹת כִּי לֹא חָמֵץ כִּי־גֹרְשׁוּ מִמִּצְרַיִם וְלֹא יָכְלוּ לְהִתְמַהְמֵהַּ
וְגַם־צֵדָה לֹא־עָשׂוּ לָהֶם׃ 40 וּמוֹשַׁב בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יָשְׁבוּ
בְּמִצְרָיִם שְׁלֹשִׁים שָׁנָה וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה׃ 41 וַיְהִי מִקֵּץ שְׁלֹשִׁים
שָׁנָה וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה וַיְהִי בְּעֶצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה יָצְאוּ כָּל־צִבְאוֹת
יְהוָה מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 42 לֵיל שִׁמֻּרִים הוּא לַיהוָה לְהוֹצִיאָם
מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם הוּא־הַלַּיְלָה הַזֶּה לַיהוָה שִׁמֻּרִים לְכָל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
לְדֹרֹתָם׃ פ

themselves from the king's tyranny, which they had every reason to fear would, after the departure of the Israelites, still more severely fall upon themselves. The misery which the native Egyptians shared with the Hebrews, engendered that sympathy of the former towards the latter, several instances of which we have already had occasion to point out (see note on iii. 22). That this "mixed multitude" did not accompany the Hebrews, because they were convinced of the truth of the new religious principles, which Moses proclaimed and preached (as *Ewald*, History of Isr. ii. 64, believes), is obvious from their very name, which distinguishes them clearly from the Israelites, both nationally and religiously, and from the manner in which they are mentioned in the Pentateuch (Numb. xi. 4, 5). The old translations are almost unanimous in rendering the meaning of ערב; Targum Onkelos and Jonathan, "many strangers;" Sept. ἐπίμικτος πολύς; Vulgate, "Vulgus promiscuum innumerabile;" Rashi explains: "a mixture of strange nations;" Ebn Ezra: "Egyptians, who associated themselves with them." And similarly almost all modern commentators.

39. ויאפו את הבצק...עגת מצות, properly: *and they baked the dough...into unleavened cakes.* אפה is, as generally the verbs of making, preparing and building, here construed with a double accusative, one of the substance, and the other of the object prepared out of that substance, like 1 Kings xviii. 32, ויבנה את האבנים מזבח, "He built an altar out of the stones." If the material follows immediately after the verb, as in these cases, it has the definite article; but if the object precedes the material, the latter stands without the article, for instance, xxxvii. 25: ויעש את המזבח עץ, "he made the altar *of* wood;" compare Gen. vi. 14.—*They were driven out of Egypt.* This statement clearly points back to the previous prediction in xi. 1; and the latter forms, therefore, an integral part of the narrative (see note on xi. 1).—עֻגָה, *a cake* baked under hot cinders, such as the orientals are still accustomed to make, especially when on a journey, or in haste. "The tribes who are always moving from place to place, bake their bread on a slightly convex iron plate, called a *sadj*, moderately heated over a low fire of brushwood or camels' dung. The lumps of dough are rolled, on a wooden platter, into thin cakes, a foot or more in diameter, and laid, by means of the roller, upon the iron. They are baked in a very short time" (*Layard*, Discoveries in Nineveh and Babylon, p. 288; where we read also a description of the preparation of unleavened bread by the Bedouins, whilst riding on horse-back, in times of haste or danger). Even in Rome there were no bakers till after the year 580 from the building of the city; "and this," says Pliny (xviii. 11), "was among

cattle. 39. And they baked the dough which they brought from Egypt into unleavened cakes, for it was not *yet* leavened; because they were driven out of Egypt, and could not tarry; nor had they prepared for themselves any provision. 40. Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, during which they dwelt in Egypt, *was* four hundred and thirty years. 41. And it came to pass at the end of four hundred and thirty years, on the self-same day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt. 42. It *is* a night of celebration to the Lord for bringing them out from the land of Egypt: this *is* that night of celebration to the Lord for all the children of Israel in their generations.

the occupations of women, as it still is in many countries."—מהה, or מהמה, in Hithpael, to delay, to tarry, see Gen. xix. 16; xliii. 10.—צדה, *provision*, for the journey (לדרך), as Rashi supplies; and the Septuagint translates *ἐπισιτισμόν ...εἰς τὴν ὁδόν*. It is clear, from the tenor of our verse, that the Israelites ate unleavened bread after the exodus, not by a command of Moses, but only in consequence of the extraordinary circumstances of that time (see *supra*, p. 183). "The law of God, and the history of Israel, reflect each other; a mere result of chance does not exist in this sphere" (*Ranke*, Untersuch. ii. p. 30, 31; *Hävernick*, Einl. I. ii. p. 425). Josephus (Antiq. II. xv. 1) asserts, that the Israelites ate unleavened bread during thirty days after their departure. However, after they reached the eastern shore of the Gulf, there existed no obvious reason why they should not prepare their bread in the usual manner, if they were still provided with flour—which might have been the case, as only after the lapse of thirty days the Israelites complained of want of food (xvi. 1—3).

40. *Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, during which they dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years.* That in spite of differing versions, this is the correct reading, and that, notwithstanding the apparent difficulties, it is to be understood in its literal sense, has been demonstrated in the *Introduction*, § 2, to which we refer.

41. *On the self-same day*, that is, on that fourteenth day of Abib, already mentioned (ver. 6; compare ver. 51; xiii. 4).—*All the hosts of the Lord*, that is, the Israelites, who are the people or army of the Lord, under whose immediate leadership they went out from the land of Egypt. This metaphor must, however, not be taken too strictly, as if the Hebrews were the *soldiers* of God, who had to *conquer* the world, and to pitch everywhere the standards of His truth; thus understood, that term necessarily leads to hazardous or artificial conclusions. Tradition takes בעצם היום הזה, "accurately and precisely after the lapse of 430 years."

42. *It is a night of celebration* (שמרים) *to the Lord* (ליי')...*this is that night of celebration to the Lord for all* (לכל) *the children of Israel.* In phrases like these, the preposition ל signifies either the deity, to whom a festival is consecrated (as פסח ליי', see ver. 11), or the persons, *by* whom it is to be celebrated. In the former sense ל is used in the first part of the sentence, whilst it has the latter signification in the second; but שִׁמֻּרִים has, in both parts the same meaning: observation or celebration (from שמר, which is frequently used in this

43 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן זֹאת חֻקַּת הַפָּסַח כָּל־בֶּן־נֵכָר
לֹא־יֹאכַל בּוֹ׃ 44 וְכָל־עֶבֶד אִישׁ מִקְנַת־כָּסֶף וּמַלְתָּה אֹתוֹ אָז
יֹאכַל בּוֹ׃ 45 תּוֹשָׁב וְשָׂכִיר לֹא־יֹאכַל בּוֹ׃ 46 בְּבַיִת אֶחָד

sense, 1 Kings xi. 10; Isa. lvi. 2, 6, etc). להוציאם is the gerund, and has here, as often, a causal sense: that night is sacred to God on account of His having led the Hebrews from Egypt. Various are the interpretations proposed on this verse; Rashi observes: "It is called ליל שמרים, because God observed and looked out to fulfil His promise to lead them out of Egypt," and finds in the words שמרים לכל בני ישראל, an allusion to the fact, that the Israelites were shielded (משומר) in that night against the devastations of the pestilence (ver. 23). But the expression ליל שמרים appears too distinct and characteristic to admit, in the same sentence, of two so different meanings, neither of which, moreover, has much probability in itself. Similar, and therefore liable to the same objections, is the exposition of Ebn Ezra, whom Philippson follows: "because God shielded them, and did not suffer destruction to approach their houses, He ordered, that that night should be observed by all Israelites by eating the paschal-lamb, unleavened bread, and bitter herbs." Other Jewish interpreters understood ליל שמרים as a night of waking or vigilance (from שמר, to watch, שומר, a watch-man), in which the Israelites are to avoid sleep, and which they are bound to pass in pious and devoted prayers connected with the miraculous deliverance from Egypt. If ליל שמרים were, in this acceptation, corroborated by any other parallel passage, that interpretation would deserve particular consideration, as it is well known that the ancients abstained from sleep in such nights, which they considered particularly holy. So, for instance, was the High Priest obliged to be awake in the night of the Day of Atonement. But the traditional practice among the Jews has but very partially observed that night as one of vigilance. The Septuagint, which takes ליל very improperly to the preceding verse, translates indistinctly, *προφυλακή ἐστι τῷ Κυρίῳ*, "It is a watch to the Lord," and *ἐκείνη ἡ νὺξ αὕτη προφυλακὴ Κυρίῳ*. But the Vulgate renders here correctly: "nox ista est observabilis Domini," and "Hanc observare debent omnes filii Israel."

43. The following verses (to ver. 50) contain supplementary precepts with regard to the individuals to be permitted to partake of the paschal-lamb (see p. 180). We have already observed, that, as this whole ceremony was the symbol of the political covenant between God and Israel, it is natural that such persons only could be admitted to it, as had, by circumcision, been *personally* received into the covenant of God: all other individuals were to be excluded. As this injunction was, no doubt, already to be observed at the first celebration of Passover in Egypt—although Ebn Ezra asserts it without reason, to have reference only to פסח דרות:—it is justly believed that it was promulgated previous to the exodus (according to tradition on the fourteenth of Nisan); and that its more appropriate place would have been after the 28th verse, but that it has been inserted here to bring it, as a general precept, into closer connection with the law concerning the sanctification of the first-born.—*There shall no alien* (בן נכר) *eat thereof*, that is, a Non-Israelite, who has not, by the act of circumcision, entered the covenant of Abraham. בן נכר, which is correctly translated by the Septuagint (*ἀλλογενής*), and Vulgate (alienigena), is rendered by Targum Onkelos: "an Israelite who has swerved from the strict observance of his religion" (דאסתלק); which sense is still more clearly expressed by the ancient reading of the same version: "an apostate Israelite" (דאשתמד). Rashi

43. And the Lord said to Moses and Aaron, This *is* the ordinance of the Pesach: There shall no alien eat thereof:
44. But every [1]male servant who is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then may he eat thereof.
45. A foreigner and a hired servant shall not eat thereof.
46. In one house shall it be eaten; thou shalt carry forth

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Man's.

follows the former more comprehensive sense, by explaining with the Rabbins: "a man whose deeds have alienated him from his Father in heaven," and a heathen and an unbelieving Israelite are, in this respect, in the same category. Targum Jonathan paraphrases similarly: "every heathen and every Israelite who has become faithless to his religion and has not repented."—בן נכר is equivalent to נכר, as adjectives are converted into substantives by placing before them בן (or מתים, איש, בעל). See on iv. 10, p. 69.

44. *But every male servant who is bought for money.* עבד איש a man servant. איש is here added to עבד, merely as an apposition, as איש כהן, a priest, איש סריס a eunuch, etc.: as in Greek ἀνήρ; for instance, ἄνδρες στρατιῶται, soldiers. It is, therefore, more adapted to translate כל עבד איש *every male servant*, than to render, with the English Version, *every man's servant*—מקנת כסף *bought for money*, literally, the purchase of money, the abstract instead of the concrete; as, vice versa, in ver. 13, the concrete is used instead of the abstract, נגף למשחית. Septuagint ἀργυρώνητον, Vulgate "servus emptitius."—*When thou hast circumcised him.* We prefer to take ו in ומלתה, as a conjunction of condition *if*, or of time *when*, instead of understanding it to introduce the apodosis: "*then* thou shalt circumcise him" (as Rosenmüller, De Wette, and others translate), which would almost exclude the alternative, that the servant declined entering into the community of Israel; and it would thus appear, that every slave of the Hebrews was compelled to undergo that ceremony; than which nothing could be more foreign to the genius of the Mosaic legislation; and Ebn Ezra remarks expressly: "he is to be circumcised, if this is his wish, and if he is of a mature age, and able to judge in religious matters." Jonathan translates: "when thou hast circumcised and baptized him" (ותטבלינֵיה); for these two ceremonies (מילה and טבילה) circumcision and baptism, were, according to rabbinical regulations, necessary for every proselyte (see *Talm.* Kerithuth ix. *a*; Abod. Sar. lvii. *a*; *Maimon.* Hilch. Issur. Biah xiii. 1; see also note on xxii. 20, *sub finem*). However different the positions were which the members of the Hebrew community occupied in society, the Mosaic law acknowledges, in a religious respect, no distinction of classes of any kind; all are equally admitted to all the sources and means of grace and salvation; there is no authority of person before the Lord; a feature in the Mosaic dispensation, the more to be appreciated if compared with the invidious exclusiveness of the principal pagan religions of the East.

45. *A foreigner* (תושב) *and a hired servant* (שכיר) *shall not eat thereof:* because neither of them, as heathens, stands in a nearer permanent connection with the Israelites; for the former is only tolerated in the land, which he may leave at his option, being bound by no religious duty or obligation; and the latter, if a heathen, may at any time be dismissed, when his services are no longer required: whilst the purchased servant (verse 44) is the permanent property of his Hebrew master, and, therefore, under conditions, admissible to the paschal rites. Ebn Ezra explains: "a Hebrew stranger and a hired servant shall not eat of the paschal-lamb, if they have not been duly counted

יֵאָכֵל לֹא־תוֹצִיא מִן־הַבַּיִת מִן־הַבָּשָׂר חוּצָה וְעֶצֶם לֹא תִשְׁבְּרוּ־בוֹ׃
47 כָּל־עֲדַת יִשְׂרָאֵל יַעֲשׂוּ אֹתוֹ׃ 48 וְכִי־יָגוּר אִתְּךָ גֵּר וְעָשָׂה
פֶסַח לַיהוָה הִמּוֹל לוֹ כָל־זָכָר וְאָז יִקְרַב לַעֲשֹׂתוֹ וְהָיָה כְּאֶזְרַח
הָאָרֶץ וְכָל־עָרֵל לֹא־יֹאכַל בּוֹ׃ 49 תּוֹרָה אַחַת יִהְיֶה לָאֶזְרָח
וְלַגֵּר הַגָּר בְּתוֹכְכֶם׃ 50 וַיַּעֲשׂוּ כָּל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה
אֶת־מֹשֶׁה וְאֶת־אַהֲרֹן כֵּן עָשׂוּ׃ ס 51 וַיְהִי
בְּעֶצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה הוֹצִיא יְהוָה אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם
עַל־צִבְאֹתָם׃ פ שביעי

for the lamb" (see verse 4), obviously against the context, which speaks of *uncircumcised* foreigners.

46. The paschal-lamb shall be eaten *in one house* (בבית אחד), that is, as Onkelos renders: בחבורא חדא in one company; every Israelite shall finish his paschal meal at the same table with the same co-religionists. This, as well as the precept not to break the bones of the paschal-lamb, are emblems of the unity of Israel, as we have already observed in the introductory survey of the Passover rites, p. 179. About the reason why nothing of the flesh shall be "carried forth out of the house," see note on verse 10.

47. That *all* the congregation of Israel shall eat the paschal-lamb, is emphatically repeated, in order to impress upon the reader unmistakably the principal and leading idea of the whole festival.—The collective noun עדה is construed with the plural יעשו; see note on i. 20.

48. *And when a stranger will sojourn with thee, and will sacrifice the Pesach to the Lord*, that is, and wishes to perform that sacred ceremony; for ועשה is here equivalent to וכי יעשה. The verb עשה is here used in the same sense of sacrificing as in the preceding verse, and in x. 25. The Septuagint and Vulgate translate more freely, although they render the sense aptly (Ἐὰν δέ τις προσέλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς προσήλυτος ποιῆσαι τὸ πάσχα Κυρίῳ; "Quod si quis peregrinorum in vestram voluerit transire coloniam et facere Phase Domini;" although the words וכי יגור אתך cannot well be understood: if a stranger *will come into* your land). Before a stranger can be permitted to kill the paschal-lamb, not only he himself but all the male members of his house must undergo the rite of circumcision; for he must eat it with his family (verse 3); and his adherence to Mosaism could not be deemed firm and unshaken, unless all the members of his family had renounced every idolatrous worship.—המול is here not the imperative, since it is doubtful whether there exists in Hebrew a *third* person of that mood; but the infinitive is applied in the

יג 1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 2 קַדֶּשׁ־לִי כָל־בְּכוֹר פֶּטֶר

CHAPTER XIII.

SUMMARY.—Besides the repeated injunction of the festival of unleavened bread (vers. 3, 6, 7), two other, specifically Mosaic, laws were enforced in connection with the deliverance from Egypt: 1. About the sanctification of all male firstborn of man and beast (vers. 2, 12, 13; see on ver. 2); and 2. About the phylacteries of the head and the hand, as a remembrance of the exodus from Egypt, and the divine commands (see on ver. 9). At the same time it is repeatedly enjoined, that the history of the miraculous release of Israel, and the meaning of all the laws based upon it, should be faithfully handed down to the coming generations and preserved in eternal and grateful reminiscence (vers. 8, 14, 15).—The narrative

nothing of the flesh abroad out of the house; nor shall you break a bone thereof. 47. All the congregation of Israel shall sacrifice it. 48. And when a stranger will sojourn with thee, and will sacrifice the Pesach to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and sacrifice it, and he shall *then* be as a native of the land: [1]but no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof. 49. One law shall be for the native and for the stranger who sojourneth in the midst of you. 50. Thus did all the children of Israel; as the Lord commanded Moses and Aaron, so they did. 51. And it came to pass on the selfsame day, *that* the Lord brought the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt by their hosts.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—For.

sense of the imperative, a usage frequent both in Hebrew and in the earlier Greek literature. The form המול is, in the same manner, used also in Gen. xvii. 10. Compare Exodus xx. 8, זכור; Deut. v. 12, שמור; Psa. xxii. 9; 2 Kings iii. 16, etc.—*But no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof.* This sentence sums up, as it were, all the preceding precepts concerning those who are to be allowed to eat the paschal-lamb without allusion to any individual class of persons, as Rashi, Ebn Ezra, and others endeavour to specify.

49. See on verse 19.

50, 51. "And the Israelites did according to the command of Moses and Aaron," which words are repeated from ver. 28, because new precepts regarding the Passover have been added; and the sense is, that the Hebrews executed all these commands, which they had an opportunity of performing, and that they especially admitted to the paschal-lamb those strangers only, who had been circumcised. Unnecessary, therefore, is Ebn Ezra's opinion, that this verse refers proleptically to Num. ix. 5, where the same words occur, since then only the Israelites had occasion to carry out all those injunctions. The same commentator opines, that the 51st verse is to be connected with the beginning of the following chapter, so that the sense is: "at the time of the exodus, God gave the command concerning the sanctification of the firstborn." But the retrospective words: "Thus the Lord brought the children of Israel out of Egypt" conclude appropriately the chapter, in which the history of the exodus has been narrated in detail. Besides, Ebn Ezra's construction would require בהוציא instead of הוציא.

CHAP. XIII. 1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. Sanctify to me all the firstborn, whatsoever openeth

then resumes the march of the Israelites, and points out first the general direction of their journey to the south, towards the desert, not northwards to the land of the Philistines, although this latter would have been the direct and shorter route (see on ver. 17); thus they proceeded from Succoth to Etham, at the northern extremity of the gulf of Suez (see on ver. 20).—The chapter concludes with two other historical remarks: 1. In fulfilment of a promise made to Joseph, the Israelites took his bones with them from Egypt (ver. 19); and 2. God leads the people miraculously on their journey by a pillar of cloud by day, and a pillar of fire by night (see note on vers. 21, 22).

כָּל־רֶחֶם בִּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בָּאָדָם וּבַבְּהֵמָה לִי הוּא׃ 3 וַיֹּאמֶר

2. The miraculous events connected with the exodus give rise to another most significant ordinance, which stamps the whole Mosaic legislation perhaps more characteristically than any of its various commands and statutes.—*Sanctify to me all the firstborn, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and beast.* The prerogatives which the firstborn enjoyed in patriarchal institutions, and which are constantly kept in view throughout the Pentateuch, did not only consist in an external preference with regard to property, but in the superior authority, which he exercised in his family, as whose legitimate representative and protector he was acknowledged and respected (see note on xi. 5). The Israelites had, even in their Egyptian bondage, preserved these ancestral notions. It was, therefore, the wise and profound intention of the Mosaic law, to combine all these honoured and influential heads of families into a powerful phalanx for the defence of their national faith, by appointing them to the perpetual religious service, as, indeed, in the patriarchal ages, the house-father, or the eldest member of the family, performed the necessary priestly functions. We must admire the profundity and comprehensiveness of this idea, so eminently calculated to create a thoroughly religious nation, and to secure an unaltered adherence to the holy doctrines. However, the legislator himself felt later the necessity of abandoning it, and of substituting for it a scheme less derangingly interfering with the social and domestic relations of the people. The tribe of Levi, from which Moses and Aaron had sprung, had on different occasions exhibited a distinguished zeal for the defence of the Law: they "say to the father and to the mother, I have not seen them; and their brothers they acknowledge not, and their children they know not; for they guard the word of God and preserve His covenant" (Deut. xxxiii. 9); and, therefore, later the religious primogeniture of the people was conferred on this tribe; 22,000 Levites took the place of as many firstborn Israelites; and every one of the 273 firstborn, who were still among the people besides that number, was bound to redeem himself with five shekels; and this was instituted as the custom for every future firstborn son in Israel, except those, whose fathers or mothers were of the tribe of Levi (see ver. 13; Num. iii. 11, *et seq.*; 40, *et seq.*). Thus the theocracy, without being converted into a hierarchy, was secured and strengthened by receiving permanent representatives of divine authority (see note on xix. 6).—The same custom prevails still among the Jews, and the ceremony of "redeeming the son" (פדיון הבן) is solemnised on the thirtieth day after the birth of the child (Deut. xviii. 16. See *Maimonides*, Hilch. Bikk. xi. and xii.).—But the firstborn animals also belonged to God, to whom they were to be offered as sacrifices; and it was therefore ordained, that all clean firstborn male beasts (*τὰ πρωτότοκα ἀῤῥενικά, Philo*) be offered from the eighth day of their birth within their first year.—Now, the flesh was, according to Deut. xii. 17, 18, and xv. 19, 20, to be consumed in the holy places by the offering Israelites; whereas, in Num. xviii. 18, it seems to be assigned to the priests: "and their flesh [that of the firstborn animals] shall belong to thee [the priest]; like the wave breast and like the right shoulder it shall be thine." This apparent contradiction has already been felt by Augustin (Quaest. xviii. in Deut.), who, however, attempted no reconciliation. Ebn Ezra and Jarchi believe, that the commands in Deut. xii. 17, 18, and xv. 19, 20, are addressed to the priests, completely against the context and the words. Not happier are the opinions of Gerhard (on Deut. xii. p. 769), that they refer to *female* firstborn animals; or of J. D. Michaelis (Mos. R. § 193), whom Jahn (Arch. iii. p. 415), and Bauer (Gottesd. Verf. i. p. 289) follow, that the *first* firstborn animal belonged to the priests, the *second* firstborn (!) to the

the womb among the children of Israel, *both* of man and of beast; it *is* mine. 3. And Moses said to the people,

Israelites; or of Eichhorn (Einleit. iii. p. 235), who simply supposes—a mistake. But the addition in Num. xviii. 18: "like the wave breast and like the right shoulder it shall be thine," fully decides the question. The *blood* and the *fat* belonged to God (ver. 17); and if we compare herewith Lev. vii. 28, *et seq.*, we find that the *breast* and the *right shoulder* were the portions of the priest; *all the other parts were retained and consumed by the Israelite.* And thus exists the greatest harmony between the different precepts concerning the firstborn of animals. (Compare Exod. xxix. 27, 28; Lev. x. 14, 15).—If they had a blemish, they were to be killed and eaten at home (Deut. xv. 21, 22); others suppose, less probably, that they were given to the priests as their property (*De Wette*, Archæol. § 206, note 9). But the firstborn of unclean animals, as horses, camels, or asses (Num. xviii. 15), was either to be redeemed by a clean animal, with the addition of the fifth part of its value, or it was to be killed (Lev. xxvii. 26, 27). If we add hereto, that the firstlings of all agricultural produce were also holy to the Lord, we have a comprehensive and consistent framework of a theocratical legislation, creating and cementing an immediate connection between God as the monarch, and Israel as His subjected people (compare note on xxii. 28, 29).—The law of the sanctification of the firstborn is in our text (ver. 15) based upon the circumstance, that the firstborn of Israel remained uninjured at the general destruction of the firstborn sons of the Egyptians, who were thus smitten because they had oppressed Israel, the *firstborn son of God* (iv. 22, 23). This was the idea, which the Israelites at all times, since the days of Moses, combined with that law, the character of which is in no way influenced by the fact, that, indeed, in all primitive or natural religions, the firstborn of men and animals were sacred to the respective deities; or by the concession, that the Israelites were, perhaps, even before Moses familiar with that idea. We observe here the same skilful commutation of an idolatrous rite into a pure religious notion, which we have already had occasion to notice in a striking instance (see p. 184, 185).—We read in Wilson's Commentary: "Aristotle was of opinion that all sacrifices to the Deity originated in the idea, that he would be gratified by the return of his choicest gifts. Hence Abraham's readiness to put to death his only son at a supposed demand from above. Agreeably to this precedent, remarks Mr. Mackay, the claim to the firstborn forms the great prerogative of God's supremacy." But the Mosaic law concerning the firstborn sons has no connection whatever with *sacrifices*, much less with *human* sacrifices; and the offering of Isaac was not the *custom*, but an unusual exception, and an extraordinary trial.—Even in our time the firstborn Israelites keep the fourteenth day of Nisan as a fast, in grateful commemoration of the miracle wrought for their ancestors (see Orach Chajim, Hilch. Pes. 470).—*Sanctify* (קַדֶּשׁ) *to me*, that is, declare holy; for the Piel has often this signification, as וְטִמֵּא אתו הכהן, "and the priest shall *declare* him impure" (see Lev. xiii. 25, 30, 34).—*All the firstborn*, which the Septuagint renders *πᾶν πρωτότοκον πρωτογενές*, with two synonyms. —*Whatsoever openeth the womb*, that is, the firstborn of the *mother*, not of the father. So Targ. Onkelos, פתח כל ולדא; Septuagint, *διανοῖγον πᾶσαν μήτραν*; Vulgate, quod aperit valvam; Rashi, שפתח את הרחם; De Wette, "alles was die Mutter bricht;" from פטר to open; compare Prov. xvii. 14; Ps. xxii. 8; or, according to Bochart, from the Arabic, فطر to begin; hence الفطر the beginning; and in Sanscrit *putra* signifies *son*.—רֶחֶם, instead of רַחַם, as the form ought to be on account of the guttural ח.—*It is mine*, for God had rescued the firstborn of

מֹשֶׁה אֶל־הָעָם זָכוֹר אֶת־הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר יְצָאתֶם מִמִּצְרַיִם מִבֵּית
עֲבָדִים כִּי בְּחֹזֶק יָד הוֹצִיא יְהוָה אֶתְכֶם מִזֶּה וְלֹא יֵאָכֵל חָמֵץ׃
4 הַיּוֹם אַתֶּם יֹצְאִים בְּחֹדֶשׁ הָאָבִיב׃ 5 וְהָיָה כִי־יְבִיאֲךָ יְהוָה
אֶל־אֶרֶץ הַכְּנַעֲנִי וְהַחִתִּי וְהָאֱמֹרִי וְהַחִוִּי וְהַיְבוּסִי אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע
לַאֲבֹתֶיךָ לָתֶת לָךְ אֶרֶץ זָבַת חָלָב וּדְבָשׁ וְעָבַדְתָּ אֶת־הָעֲבֹדָה
הַזֹּאת בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַזֶּה׃ 6 שִׁבְעַת יָמִים תֹּאכַל מַצֹּת וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי
חַג לַיהוָה׃ 7 מַצּוֹת יֵאָכֵל אֵת שִׁבְעַת הַיָּמִים וְלֹא־יֵרָאֶה לְךָ
חָמֵץ וְלֹא־יֵרָאֶה לְךָ שְׂאֹר בְּכָל־גְּבֻלֶךָ׃ 8 וְהִגַּדְתָּ לְבִנְךָ בַּיּוֹם
הַהוּא לֵאמֹר בַּעֲבוּר זֶה עָשָׂה יְהוָה לִי בְּצֵאתִי מִמִּצְרָיִם׃ 9 וְהָיָה

Israel, and might thus consider them as His especial property.

3. זכור. *Remember*, the infinitive, instead of the imperative, like המול, in xii. 48; Septuagint, Μνημονεύετε; Vulgate, "Mementote."—*From the house of slaves*, that is, from the country, where they were severely treated like despised bondsmen; and hence Egypt is frequently denoted the *iron furnace* of the Israelites (כור הברזל), Deut. iv. 20; 1 Kings viii. 51; Jer. xi. 4; see note on i. 14.—בחזק יד, *by strength of hand*, instead of ביד חזקה, with a strong hand, the substantive in the stat. constr. being used instead of an adjective.—ולא יאכל. The construction is: Remember this day...not to eat anything leavened.

4. About חדש האביב, see notes on ix. 31, and xii. 2.

5. Here five tribes of the Canaanites are mentioned, whilst, naturally, all the others are also included. In Gen. xv. 19, ten, in Deut. vii. 1, seven, and in Exod. iii. 8, 17, six nations of Canaan are enumerated, without any difference in the real meaning; the more important nations imply the weaker tribes also; and in Josh. i. 4, even the whole *ideal* land of the Israelites, to the Lebanon and the Euphrates, is called the land of the Hittites; compare *Reland*, Palest. pp. 99, 100. In ver. 11, כנעני alone is used for all the inhabitants of Canaan. The additions of the Samaritan and Alexandrine Versions in our text, are, therefore, uncalled for.—About the phrase ארץ זבת חלב ודבש, see note on iii. 8.—ועבדת את העבדה הזאת; Vulgate, aptly: "Celebratis hunc morem sacrorum." It is evident, from the context, that the killing of the paschal-lamb is chiefly to be understood by "this service," as that was only, according to Deut. xvi. 5—7, to be sacrificed "in the place which the Lord chose for Himself to dwell in," although we must admit that it was offered in the desert of Sinai, in the time of Moses (Numb. ix. 1—5), and, according to Josh. v. 10, 11, in Gilgal, under the leadership of Joshua. The precept about the unleavened bread, however, was, no doubt, observed also during the seven days from the fifteenth to the twenty-first of Abib (see xii. 15, 16).

6. *Seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread.* The Samaritan and Septuagint Versions have here *six* days, apparently leaning on Deut. xvi. 8, where we read: "six days shalt thou eat unleavened bread, and on the seventh day is the final assembly to the Lord thy God." But the sense of this verse is, that six days unleavened bread shall be eaten, but that on the seventh, besides this observance, a holy convocation shall be held; or that unleavened bread shall be eaten during six days *besides* the first, the celebration of which had been treated more fully in the preceding verses. *And on the seventh*

Remember this day, on which you went out from Egypt, out of the house of slaves; for by strength of hand the Lord brought you out from there: nothing leavened shall be eaten. 4. This day are you gone out, in the month Abib. 5. And it shall be, when the Lord will bring thee into the land of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, which He swore to thy fathers to give thee, a land flowing with milk and honey, that thou shalt keep this service in this month. 6. Seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread, and on the seventh day *shall* be a feast to the Lord. 7. Unleavened bread shall be eaten those seven days; and there shall nothing leavened be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven seen with thee, in all thy boundaries. 8. And thou shalt [1]tell thy son in that day, saying, *This is done* because of that *which* the Lord did to me when I went out of Egypt. 9. And it shall be for a

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Show.

day shall be a feast to the Lord. See note on xii. 16.

7. מצות יאכל. *Unleavened bread shall be eaten.* The plural מצות is constructed with the singular, which is sometimes the case when the verb is in the passive, and can be understood impersonally: "One may eat unleavened bread;" Septuagint, ἔδεσθε. See note on x. 8. Less acceptable seems the explanation of Ewald (Gr. § 569, whom Maurer follows), that מצות is to be taken as a collective noun, opposed to חמץ; for מצות has distinctly a plural signification. About חמץ and שאר, see note on xii. 15.—יראה, in our verse, is identical with ימצא in xii. 19.

8. And thou shalt tell (והגדת) thy son on that day saying: בעבור זה עשה יי לי וכ'; this ellipsis is thus to be supplied: *this festival is celebrated* on account of that *which* the Lord has done to me, when I went out of Egypt. The relative pronoun אשר is here omitted as in numerous other passages, for instance, xviii. 20; Psa. cxviii. 24, etc. Other interpreters explain, though not ungrammatically, at least less simply: on account, or for the purpose of this commandment, i.e. in order to honour me with the Passover precepts, has the Lord done to me all these wonders, when I went out of Egypt. So, among others, Targum Jonathan, Septuagint, Rashi, Maurer and De Wette, who aptly quotes, as a parallel, Genesis xviii. 5, where cause and effect are also changed. The Vulgate (hoc est quod fecit mihi Dominus) omits, inaccurately, the preposition בעבור.

9. On Phylacteries (תפלין).

It was the wise intention of the legislator, to make the great act of the Egyptian redemption as profitable for virtue and morality as its nature would allow. Not easily was, in the history of the Hebrew nation, an event to be expected, the grandeur of which was so much calculated to rouse all minds, however obtuse, and lastingly to impress them with the omnipotence and loving Providence of the God of their fathers. Therefore, besides the observances already established, besides the Passover with its numerous rites—the appointment of the

לְךָ לְאוֹת עַל־יָדְךָ וּלְזִכָּרוֹן בֵּין עֵינֶיךָ לְמַעַן תִּהְיֶה תּוֹרַת יְהוָה

month of Abib as the first of the year—and the sanctification of the first-born—a series of other precepts was introduced which tended to keep in permanent and lively commemoration both that great event and the precepts of the Law, which was the ulterior and proper end of Israel's redemption (iii. 12); and thus to exercise a beneficial influence upon the ennoblement of the heart and the improvement of conduct. For a people little practised in abstract ideas, and sunk in slavish mental torpor, the prudent legislator thought it advisable to facilitate the understanding of the laws by visible, external symbols and signs; and, for this purpose, he chose: 1. Memorials to be borne on the arm and the forehead (phylacteries תפלין); 2. Memorials to be written on the door-posts of the houses (מזוזות Deut. vi. 9; xi., 20); and 3. Fringes and threads, to be worn on the borders of the garments (ציצת Numb. xv. 37—41); with respect to which it is expressly said (ver. 39, 40): "and you shall see them and shall remember all the commandments of the Lord and do them." These three precepts, and the practical support they afford, are comprised in the following talmudical passage: "He who has *Tefillin* on his head and his arm—and *Zizith* on his garment—and a *Mesusah* on his door—has every possible guarantee that he will not sin" (Menach. 33 b.).

We shall here speak only of the first symbol, the תפלין. And herein, also, Moses judiciously leaned on the custom of eastern nations, to write important sentences of religion or of wordly wisdom on paper, or linen strips, and to wear them round the neck or on the forehead; or even to burn into the hand all kinds of significant signs with the ashes of *Henna*, which produces an indelible colour. Now, if according to heathen notions such strips were supposed, like amulets, to be a preservative against dangers and misfortunes, Moses refining or spiritualizing this belief, could justly assert, that indeed the observance of the divine commandments, which were symbolized by the Tefillin, was the most efficacious protection against all the trials and vicissitudes of fate. Our passage, however, affords very little information about the nature of this symbol; it says merely: "And it shall be for a sign to thee upon thy hand, and for a memorial (לזכרון) between thy eyes." Nor can we derive any distinct inferences from the other passages, which treat on the same commandment (ver. 16; Deut. vi. 8, and xi. 18), where only instead of לזכרון (memorial), the obscure expression טוטפת is used (see *infra*). Therefore a not inconsiderable number of interpreters have conceived the whole phrase metaphorically, among others the Karaites, Jerome, Grotius, Michaelis, Schoeltzen, Rosenmüller, Hengstenberg, and Winer; so that its meaning would be: the miraculous redemption from Egypt, all precepts connected with it, and, generally, the whole Law, shall unchangingly live in your hearts and minds, and constitute the invariable rule for all your actions. It must be admitted, that similar figurative phrases are found in other Biblical books; but this is only the case in *poetical* portions, as Prov. iii. 3: "Bind them (the commandments) round thy neck, write them on the tablet of thy heart;" vi. 21: "Bind them (the precepts of thy father) always on thy heart, fasten them on thy neck;" vii. 3: "Bind them on thy finger, write them on the tablet of thy heart." Compare also Isaiah xlix. 18; Cant. viii. 6; Jer. xxii. 24; Haggai ii. 23. But, although our verse, considered by itself, does not exactly exclude a similar interpretation, yet partly the connection in which that precept stands in other passages, and partly the analogy with similar symbols, forbids such conception. For, 1. In Deut. vi. 9, and xi. 20, those words are followed by the precept: "and thou shalt write them on the door-posts of thy house and on thy gates;" and, as this command is not to be taken figuratively, but literally, so our passage also; 2. The com-

sign to thee upon thy hand, and for a memorial between thy eyes, that the Law of the Lord may be in thy mouth; for with a strong hand hath the Lord brought thee out of

mandment about the fringes (ציצת) shows unmistakably the tendency of the Mosaic law, by all kinds of *symbols* to stimulate and excite the mind to the exercise of the moral precepts; to this comes 3. as Philippson rightly observes, that in our verse the *end* of the external action is immediately introduced by למען: "that the Law of the Lord may be in thy mouth," whereas the simple conjunction ו would be required, if the preceding words had the same internal, figurative meaning. Of all the arguments which Hengstenberg (Pentat. i. p. 458) urges for the contrary opinion, not one is tenable. But, starting from the unity of the Pentateuch, it appears perfectly inadmissible, to take with Winer (Bibl. Dict. ii. 260) our passage figuratively, and that in Deuteronomy literally, and to consider the latter as a sort of materializing explanation from a later period.

The Biblical text speaks only in general terms of this precept; it decides nothing on the form of those memorials, what they must contain and how and when they are to be worn. The only nearer qualification is suggested by the expression: "you shall *bind* them" (וקשרתם); less suggestive is the word טוטפת, which stands there instead of לזכרון. The etymology of this word (which Jablonsky II. 347, even believes to be the Egyptian) is uncertain. The various ancient, mostly absurd opinions, have been collected and reviewed by Buxtorf (Lex. Chal. p. 869), and Michaelis (Suppl. p. 1009—1011). The derivation first proposed by Fuller (Miscell. Sacr. v. 7), and then almost universally adopted is from the not used root טוף, signifying, as in Arabic, *to surround, to encircle*, whence טוטפת is formed by the reduplication of the two chief radicals instead of טְטְפָּפוֹת as בָּבֶל stands for בַּלְבֵּל; so that the substantive טוטף would signify a circle or tie, or band, *ligamentum*; and the Chaldean translators use טוטפתא in the signification of *tiara* (2 Sam. i. 10; Esth. viii. 15; Ez. xxiv. 17, 23. Compare *Talm.* Sabb. 57, where it is explained: "an ornament which goes round from one ear to the other"). According to the precept of our text, this band was of a double nature: on the hand, and "between the eyes," that is, on the forehead; or, as Fuller believes, a kind of chain (*monile*; monile frontis and monile brachii manusve; which word would, according to its etymology from *monere*, to remind, coincide in a remarkable way with לזכרון, for which טטפות is used in the parallel passage; see Rosenmüller on ver. 16). In the later Jewish literature the word תפלין (or תפילין) is applied to this memorial; and thus it is already rendered by the Targumim. It is evidently derived from פלל, to pray, not (as Fuller and others opine) from תפל=טפל, to connect, to bind; and signifies, therefore, "prayer-thongs," ligamenta precatoria. In Matt. xxiii. 5, they are called φυλακτήρια, phylacteries, which would, after the easiest derivation (from φυλάσσειν, namely, τὸν νόμον, *to keep* the law) concur with זכרון, remembrance; to connect it with φυλάσσειν in the sense of *protecting*, so that phylacteries would be "protecting amulets," is too artificial; certainly this signification was not attached to the word in the Apostle's time.

Now tradition has made the most extended use of the liberty left to it with regard to the Tefillin by the indistinctness of the text, and has compiled very minute precepts concerning their arrangement and their use. In accordance with the text were ordered, phylacteries of the hand (תפלין של יד) and phylacteries of the head (תפלין של ראש). They consist of small square leather boxes, the former with one leather thong, which is tied round the left arm and the fingers; the latter with a double thong, which hangs down at both sides of the head. The box contains, on parchment-

בְּפִ֑יךָ כִּ֚י בְּיָ֣ד חֲזָקָ֔ה הוֹצִֽאֲךָ֥ יְהוָ֖ה מִמִּצְרָֽיִם׃ 10 וְשָׁמַרְתָּ֛ אֶת־
הַחֻקָּ֥ה הַזֹּ֖את לְמוֹעֲדָ֑הּ מִיָּמִ֖ים יָמִֽימָה׃ פ
11 וְהָיָ֞ה כִּֽי־יְבִֽאֲךָ֤ יְהוָה֙ אֶל־אֶ֣רֶץ הַֽכְּנַעֲנִ֔י כַּאֲשֶׁ֛ר נִשְׁבַּ֥ע לְךָ֖
וְלַאֲבֹתֶ֑יךָ וּנְתָנָ֖הּ לָֽךְ׃ 12 וְהַֽעֲבַרְתָּ֥ כָל־פֶּֽטֶר־רֶ֖חֶם לַֽיהוָ֑ה וְכָל־

strips, the following four sections from the Pentateuch: 1. About the sanctification of the first-born, Exod. xiii. 1—10; 2. Further precepts about the same subject, ver. 11—16; 3. The observance of the Law and its injunction to the rising generation, Deut. vi. 4—9; and 4. The blessing attending the strict adherence to the divine precepts, Deut. xi. 13—21; which four passages, according to the Kabbalah, signify the wisdom, the reason, the grandeur, and the power of God (גבורה, גדולה, בינה, חכמה); and the ספר החנוך says on this point: "And these four portions have been chosen in preference to all the other passages of the Pentateuch, because they embrace the submission under the yoke of the kingdom of heaven, and the unity of the Creator, and the exodus from Egypt; and these are the fundamental doctrines of Judaism; therefore we are commanded to put them on the forehead and on the tablets of the heart; for, according to the philosophers, those two parts of the body are the seats of reason and of feeling; and by applying to them the phylacteries, those faculties are strengthened, and produce a higher degree of piety and religious obedience." And in accordance with this idea, the phylacteries of the hand are put on the upper part of the left arm, just opposite the heart — the source of feeling,—and those of the head on the brow, there where the marrow of the brain—the seat of understanding—is supposed to commence.

Manifold are the other symbolical interpretations by which it has been tried to elucidate the idea of the Tefillin, and of which we shall adduce but a few more. According to the Talmud (Chul. 88 b), Abraham received already the commandment concerning the fringes (ציצת) and the Tefillin (see Gen. xiv. 23); and as he was by the former, as it were, invested with the *priestdom* (כהונה), so by the latter with the *kingdom* (מלכות; see Nedar. 32); so that the Tefillin of the arm signify the *power*, those of the head the diadem or the *crown* (see Succ. 25; Moed Kat. 15). But this kingdom is not of an earthly but a heavenly or religious character; for it is only intended to arm the Israelite with the *power* of self-denial, the chief of all moral duties, and procure him the *triumph* over the realms of sin. In this acceptation, the *thongs*, which are fastened to the boxes, would symbolize the *self-fettering* by the divine commands, and thus coincide with the innermost essence of religion itself (for religio is derived from religare, "to fetter," as in Hebrew מוסר from יָסַר "to bind"). In the book Cusari (iii. 11) we read an explanation of the Tefillin, which is based upon the simple wording of our text: "Thus the Israelite unites his thoughts with God by certain observances, which either Holy Writ or tradition has taught him. He wears Tefillin at the head, the organ of the faculty of reflection and memory; and lets from thence hang down thongs which reach to the hand, and which he shall see at every hour; he wears further the Tefillin of the hand, issuing from the heart, the source of our powers. Those portions, which are written in the Tefillin, relate to the unity of God, to reward and punishment, and the exodus from Egypt, because this is an undeniable proof that God is invisibly connected with His creatures, watches over them with His providence, and knows their deeds" (compare *Talm.* Men. 37 *b*; *Maimonides* Hilch. Tef. iii. 12, vii. 2; Tur Orach Chaj. 25, 27; Chob. Haleb. ii. 5).

Egypt. 10. Thou shalt therefore keep this ordinance in its season from year to year.—11. And it shall be, when the Lord will bring thee into the land of the Canaanites, as He swore to thee and thy fathers, and will give it thee, 12. That thou shalt set apart to the Lord all that openeth the womb, and every firstborn which is brought forth by a beast, which thou hast; the males *shall be* to the Lord.

Although the phylacteries were originally, at least by pious persons, worn throughout the whole day (see Cusari *loc. cit.*), their use was later limited to the time of the morning prayer (except on the Sabbaths and festivals), and to the men; and, in this circumstance no doubt the name תפלין "prayer-thongs" originated. All these details are already ascribed to Moses (*Maimon.* Hilch. Tef. i. 3, and iii. 1), and, from this reason, observed with the greater strictness. Certain it is, that this so striking commandment of the Tefillin, daily practised and executed, has contributed, not a little, to keep the Jews in their dispersion after the exile, in their peculiarity and in strict Mosaism: and thus the end of the legislator was, in this point also, completely accomplished. For further explanation on this subject we refer to *Maimonides*, Hilch. Tefillin; *Othon*. Lex. Rabb. p. 756, *et seq.*; *M. Beck*, De Judæorum ligamentis precatoris; *Buxtorf*, Syn. Jud. p. 170, *et seq.*

10. *Thou shalt therefore keep this ordinance* (החקה) i.e. Passover with all its specified rites; for the text, after having briefly inserted the precept concerning the phylacteries, returns now to the leading idea which occasioned that precept.—למועדה *in its season* or appointed time, from יעד to appoint, viz. at the full moon of the first month.—מימים ימימה *from year to year*, so explain already Ebn Ezra and Rashi; and, in this sense the same phrase is also used in Judges xi. 40; xxi. 19; 1 Sam. i. 3; ii. 19; although the opinion of Hengstenberg, that it signifies, exclusively, the time of Passover, is not tenable. ימים alone in the sense of *year*, occurs in Lev. xxv. 29; Judges xvii. 10, etc. Targum Onkelos translates: "from time to time" (like מועד), and Septuagint literally: ἀφ' ἡμερῶν εἰς ἡμέρας, and so the Vulgate; but Jonathan erroneously refers החקה to the precept of the phylacteries and paraphrases: "and thou shalt keep this commandment of the Tefillin in its proper time; on work days, not on the Sabbaths or festivals; and by day, not by night."

11. The law concerning the sanctification of the first-born, which had been alluded to only in general terms (verse 2), is here (to verse 15) more fully developed; and it appears, from our verse, that the execution of that precept was only to be enforced after the conquest of the Holy Land by the Israelites, as was the case with the sacrifice of the paschal-lamb; see on verse 5. About the comprehensive meaning of כנעני see ibid.

12. *Thou shalt set apart.* This correct rendering of the English Version is in accordance with the explanation of Ebn Ezra: "thou shalt put it aside for the Lord, lest it be mixed and confounded with other beasts," with the interpretation of Rashi (לשון הפרשה), and the translation of the Septuagint (καὶ ἀφοριεῖς); see Numb. xxvii. 8.—About פטר רחם, see note on verse 2.—*And every first-born which is brought forth by a beast.* שֶׁגֶר from the antiquated root שגר which signifies in the Aramaic dialects *to cast forth*, analogous to the German idiom: "Junge *werfen*." Mendelssohn translates, therefore, appropriately: "und alles Männliche, das von deinem Vieh zuerst geworfen worden ist." Targum Onkelos renders also ולד fœtus, and Rashbam explains quite etymologically שלוח מן הבטן. *The male first-born* only (הזכרים) were

פֶּטֶר ׀ שֶׁגֶר בְּהֵמָה אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה לְךָ הַזְּכָרִים לַֽיהוָֽה׃ 13 וְכָל־פֶּטֶר
חֲמֹר תִּפְדֶּה בְשֶׂה וְאִם־לֹא תִפְדֶּה וַעֲרַפְתּוֹ וְכֹל בְּכוֹר אָדָם
בְּבָנֶיךָ תִּפְדֶּֽה׃ מפטיר 14 וְהָיָה כִּֽי־יִשְׁאָלְךָ
בִנְךָ מָחָר לֵאמֹר מַה־זֹּאת וְאָמַרְתָּ אֵלָיו בְּחֹזֶק יָד הוֹצִיאָנוּ יְהוָה
מִמִּצְרַיִם מִבֵּית עֲבָדִֽים׃ 15 וַיְהִי כִּֽי־הִקְשָׁה פַרְעֹה לְשַׁלְּחֵנוּ וַיַּהֲרֹג
יְהוָה כָּל־בְּכוֹר בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִבְּכֹר אָדָם וְעַד־בְּכוֹר בְּהֵמָה
עַל־כֵּן אֲנִי זֹבֵחַ לַֽיהוָה כָּל־פֶּטֶר רֶחֶם הַזְּכָרִים וְכָל־בְּכוֹר בָּנַי
אֶפְדֶּֽה׃ 16 וְהָיָה לְאוֹת עַל־יָדְכָה וּלְטוֹטָפֹת בֵּין עֵינֶיךָ כִּי בְּחֹזֶק
יָד הוֹצִיאָנוּ יְהוָה מִמִּצְרָֽיִם׃

to be sanctified to God; see note on verse 2.

13. ***And every firstling of an ass thou shalt redeem with a lamb***, with the addition of the fifth part of its value, according to Levit. xxvii. 27. Although the same precept applies to all kinds of unclean animals, as horses and camels (as is evident from Numb. xviii. 15), the firstborn of the *ass* is here expressly mentioned, because this was, probably, the only species of beasts of burden which the Israelites possessed after the exodus; and the tradition has embellished this fact by attributing that distinction to the asses on account of the services they did to the Israelites in carrying their golden treasures from the land of their oppressors. ***Thou shalt redeem with a lamb.*** The priest receives a lamb for himself, and then the firstborn ass is allowed for the use of the Israelites.—***And if thou wilt not redeem it then thou shalt break its neck.*** ערף, a denominative verb, from עֹרֶף, neck; compare xxxiv. 20; Deut. xxi. 4, 6; Isa. lxvi. 3; Onkelos, ותנקפיה. The text of the Septuagint, which renders: ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀλλάξῃς λυτρώσῃ αὐτό, seems here to be corrupted. This precept, to kill an unredeemed male unclean animal, implies no "blood-steeped cruelty" (*Wilson*), since it was in the power of the owner to redeem it; but in order to ensure the scrupulous and faithful execution of this command, on which the whole structure of the Mosaic theocracy is based (see on ver. 2); the legislator wished to deter from transgressing it by the severe injunction of putting such unredeemed animal to death, which has undoubtedly been done but in very few cases, as it would have been to the owner's pecuniary injury.—***And all the firstborn of men among thy sons shalt thou redeem*** with five shekels, according to Num. iii. 47.

ס ס ס

17 וַיְהִי בְּשַׁלַּח פַּרְעֹה אֶת־הָעָם וְלֹא־נָחָם אֱלֹהִים דֶּרֶךְ אֶרֶץ

17. After the people has been instructed in all the laws called forth by the departure from Egypt, the narrative proceeds with the further journeys and fates of the Israelites. First, the general direction of their wanderings is distinctly thus stated: "God did not lead the Israelites the shorter way through the territory of Philistia, but ordered them to take the opposite route to the desert of the Red Sea." This is clear in itself. From Rameses to Gaza, the most southern town of the Philistine Pentapolis, is a straight and much frequented

13. And every firstling of an ass thou shalt redeem with a lamb; and if thou wilt not redeem it, then thou shalt break its neck: and all the firstborn of man among thy [1]sons shalt thou redeem.
14. And it shall be when thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What *is* this? that thou shalt say to him, By strength of hand the Lord brought us out from Egypt, from the house of slaves:
15. And it came to pass, when Pharaoh hardened himself *not* to let us go, that the Lord slew all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both the firstborn of man, and the firstborn of beast: therefore I sacrifice to the Lord all the males that open the womb; but all the firstborn of my [1]sons I redeem.
16. And it shall be for a sign upon thy hand, and for frontlets between thy eyes: for by strength of hand the Lord brought us forth out of Egypt.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Children.

14. מחר, originally, *to-morrow*, here, *in time to come*, as in Josh. iv. 21; xxii. 27. Gesenius (Thes. p. 784) believes it to be contracted from יום אחר, *a later day*, for Jonathan renders מָחָר sometimes יוֹמְחָרָא; see on iv. 10.—*What is this?* that is, "What signifies this commandment about the firstborn?"

15. Although the usual phrase for "harden the heart" is הקשה לב, the substantive לב might be omitted, as is the case in הקשה ערף, for which in Job ix. 4, הקשה alone is used (מי הקשה אליו וישלם, who defies Him and remains safe?). We have, therefore, abandoned the rendering of the English Version, *when Pharaoh would hardly let us go.*—*The Lord smote all the firstborn of Egypt* (and rescued our firstborn, and those of our cattle), *therefore I sacrifice to the Lord all male firstlings*, naturally with the restriction regarding the unclean animals (ver. 13). The sanctification of the firstborn took place, not on account of the death of the firstborn of the Egyptians, but in memory of the preservation of those of the Israelites. These, and the similar precepts, are the only regulations of the Mosaic law concerning the education of the children; all the rest was left to the exigencies of the times, and the individual judgment of the parents.

16. About טוטפת, and the meaning of the whole verse, see note on ver. 9.

17. And it came to pass, when Pharaoh had allowed the people to go, that God led them not *on* the way of the

way of eight to ten days, either northwards, through the pass of Dshebel-el-Tih as Russegger travelled (iii. 55), or more eastwards, through that of Dshebel-el-Edshmeh (*Robinson*, i. 124, 438); and the sons of Jacob journeyed, in not many days, from Palestine to Egypt, to buy corn. But, instead of taking this way northwards, they turned to the south or south-east, encamping first in Succoth (see note on xii. 37), and thence proceeding in the same direction to the extreme point of the Gulf of Suez, to Etham, which naturally forms, at the same time as it

פְּלִשְׁתִּים כִּי קָרוֹב הוּא כִּי ׀ אָמַר אֱלֹהִים פֶּן־יִנָּחֵם הָעָם בִּרְאֹתָם
מִלְחָמָה וְשָׁבוּ מִצְרָיְמָה׃ 18 וַיַּסֵּב אֱלֹהִים ׀ אֶת־הָעָם הַדֶּרֶךְ

were, the *boundary* of the desert of the peninsula of Sinai (ver. 20). From the very beginning this had been the intention of Moses in his scheme of deliverance, for he had invariably requested Pharaoh to permit the Israelites to sacrifice in the *desert*, and already, at the first revelation of God on Horeb, it was announced to him, that the descendants of Jacob would serve God at that mountain (iii. 12). It is true, that this route is little inviting or to be recommended; both the wide, barren, and waterless sand-plains, and the wild, rocky and rugged mountainous tracts, seem little advantageous for the march or the maintenance of such a vast number of emigrants. But the reasons which induced Moses to choose this way are as obvious as they are convincing. First, he apprehended, that if the Israelites should see the necessity of fighting with the powerful and warlike Philistines, they would avail themselves of the little distance which separated them from Egypt, and timidly return to the old yoke of slavery, rather than venture a doubtful combat for liberty, fame and property. And, indeed, the Israelites, who had just escaped, as if from a dungeon, a mass without discipline and without energy, were not yet, in any degree, prepared for regular warfare (see note on xiv. 10), and much less enabled to encounter a tribe which they were, even in the height of their power, incapable of perfectly subduing, and to which they, in future ages, succumbed more than once. Hereto may be added, that even then the Philistines were inimically opposed to the Israelites (1 Chron. vii. 21, 22; compare Targum Jonathan on ver. 17); and no doubt seized eagerly every opportunity of punishing, by new triumphs, the boldness of the Hebrew freebooters. Already in the times of Joshua, the Philistines appeared in a federal union of five states, governed by their respective chiefs (סרנים), the principal towns of which were: Gaza, Ashdod, Askelon, Gath and Ekron, besides many other open villages (1 Sam. vi. 18). Moses, therefore, with the same moderation with which he had repressed, for more than forty years, his fiery patriotism for the deliverance of his people, in order not to endanger the success of his important undertaking by rash and untimely attempts, chose here, likewise, the more laborious and wearisome but more certain and promising plan, first to accustom his uncivilised co-religionists to fatigues and hardships by a long and tiresome march in the desert; then to lead them, by a new comprehensive and noble religious system, to morality and to obedience to their invisible guide, and His earthly representative; further to train them to military discipline and martial virtue by occasional expeditions against weaker tribes of the desert; and then at last, thus internally and externally organised, to bring them by long circuits from the east of the Jordan into the land of promise. This plan was conceived by Moses with such self-denial, that he scarcely seems to have considered, whether he would himself have the happiness and glory to witness and to enjoy the results of such a protracted and complicated expedition; but for this modest disinterestedness and moderation, which almost reaches the limits of humanity, rests on his name the blessing of his people to the latest generations; for it was only by this moderation, that the ultimate success of the hazardous undertaking was secured. Thus were the forty years of wandering through the desert a time of trial, of purification, and of religious preparation for their national independence (see Deut. viii. 2; Hos. ii. 16). By these considerations the following groundless and often repeated remark of Goethe (West-Oestl. Div. p. 438) finds its refutation: "The picture of a man, who

land of the Philistines, although that *was* near; for God said, Lest perhaps the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt: 18. But God [1] let the people turn to the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea: and

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Led the people about through the way.

like Moses, was by his nature driven to the highest aims, must be quite disfigured, if we see a vigorous, resolute, quick man of active life, without meaning [?] or necessity roam about on a small territory and in the face of his great aim, with an enormous number of men" (compare note to xvi. 2; see also Num. xiv. 23, 30).—Those commentators, who like Philippson, place Succoth *north*-east of Rameses, that is just in the direction of the land of the Philistines, are compelled to suppose, that the plan of the journey was already altered at Succoth, and that the Israelites returned there already, whereas this only took place after the following station in Etham (see note on xiv. 1—3). Now, according to the notions and the language of the Pentateuch, this divine plan serves at the same time as a means for further ends, namely for the glorification of the name of God among the nations, for an exhortation to renounce the idols and to adore the omnipotent Lord of the Universe, and for the chastisement of refractory minds, especially the still hardhearted despot of Egypt (xiv. 3, *et seq.*). —ולא נחם *then God led them not;* ו has here, as Ebn Ezra correctly observes, the power of the Arabic conjunction ف which begins the apodosis, or denotes the succession in time.—God led them not in the way of the land of the Philistines כי קרוב הוא, "*although* that was near." Many ancient and modern interpreters (Targumim, Septuagint, Ebn Ezra, Rashi, Rosenmüller, and others), translate כי here in its usual signification of *because*. But we have retained the translation of *although*, as offered in the English Version, and adopted also by Gesenius and others; for it is sophistical to say, that a person does not take a certain route, just *because* it is the shortest; on the contrary, the inspired author deems it necessary, to anticipate the objection of the reader in this respect; and then only to add the reason, why they, in spite of that argument in its favour, did not take that way: "*for God said,*" etc. But in fact the significations of *because* and *although* are here closely connected; if we translate: they did not go the way of the Philistines, "for this would have been the nearest route"; this parenthetical *for* approaches in its sense very nearly to *although*. כי, in the meaning of "although," occurs also in Deut. xxix. 18; Josh. xvii. 18; Ps. cxvi. 10.—The construction פן ינחם...ושבו, that is, the transition of the future into the preterite with וְ, if the action proceeds, is like in Gen. iii. 22: פן ישלח...ולקח; compare Gen. xxxii. 12. The same change takes place after the imperative, Gen. vi. 21.

18. *But God let the people turn to the way of the wilderness.* The signification of ויסב cannot be doubtful after the explanation of the preceding verse; only the general *direction* of the march, not its *nature* shall here be described; the Israelites did not journey towards the land of the Philistines, but they turned just away from it to the southern line towards the desert. Those translations which deviate from this acceptation destroy the clearness of the text; and thus the English Version, which renders: "But God led the people about, through the way of the wilderness." About the Chaldaism וַיַּסֵּב instead of וַיָּסֶב, in which the shortening of the vowel is compensated by the dagesh forte in the following consonant, see p. 145. A similar instance is יַנְחִלֵם, instead of ינחילם, 1 Sam. ii. 8; compare Deut. i. 44; Isaiah xxiv. 12; Job iv. 20.—*The way of the wilderness of the Red Sea;* thus ים סוף is to be taken

הַמִּדְבָּר יַם־סוּף וַחֲמֻשִׁים עָלוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 19 וַיִּקַּח
מֹשֶׁה אֶת־עַצְמוֹת יוֹסֵף עִמּוֹ כִּי הַשְׁבֵּעַ הִשְׁבִּיעַ אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
לֵאמֹר פָּקֹד יִפְקֹד אֱלֹהִים אֶתְכֶם וְהַעֲלִיתֶם אֶת־עַצְמֹתַי מִזֶּה
אִתְּכֶם׃ 20 וַיִּסְעוּ מִסֻּכֹּת וַיַּחֲנוּ בְאֵתָם בִּקְצֵה הַמִּדְבָּר׃ 21 וַיהוָה
הֹלֵךְ לִפְנֵיהֶם יוֹמָם בְּעַמּוּד עָנָן לַנְחֹתָם הַדֶּרֶךְ וְלַיְלָה בְּעַמּוּד אֵשׁ

as the status constructus governed by המדבר; not as Onkelos and Rashi do, as an accusative denoting the direction, like לים סוף to the Red Sea. About ים סוף, see note on x. 19, and ii. 3.—*And the children of Israel went up harnessed* (חמשים) *out of the land of Egypt.* This is the only signification of חמשים adapted to this context and the other passages, where it occurs, namely, Josh. i. 14; iv. 12; Judg. vii. 11; and is a proper synonym to חלוצים, which is, in Num. xxxii. 30, 32, and Deut. iii. 18, used instead of חמשים. The etymology of both words is analogous, for חלוץ belongs to חלצים, *loins*, and חמוש is kindred with חֹמֶשׁ, ilia, abdomen (2 Sam. ii. 23), so that either expression would signify "with girded loins," or equipped and arrayed for war. The root חמש may further be traced to the Arabic verb حمس, to be active or manly in battle. In the same sense has חמשים been rendered by the Targumim (מזרזין and מזירנין), Aquila ad Symmachus (καθωπλισμένοι), Saadiah, Ebn Ezra, ("they went out with high hand, with military arms, and not like fugitive slaves"), Rashi (well armed; in order to account for the future wars fought by the Hebrews against the tribes of the desert), Rashbam (with arms), and almost all the modern translators and commentators. It is, therefore, scarcely necessary to examine and to refute the other significations attributed to חמשים. The Septuag. renders: πέμπτῃ δὲ γενεᾷ ἀνέβησαν, "they returned in the fifth generation," after the analogy of שלשים and רבעים, xx. 5; but this would require חֲמִשִּׁים, not חֲמֻשִׁים, and would besides be at variance with Gen. xv. 16 (דור רביעי).—Rashi quotes the following interpretation without adopting it: "one from five went out; for four parts had died during the three days of darkness." Fuller, like Theodotion, Montanus, and others: "per πεμπάδας, in certi numeri agmina distributos"; Pococke: "agmine ad exercitus formam seu ordinem composito ascenderunt, i. e., egressi sunt in ordines suos distributi"; Michaelis: "quinquageni, in cohortes quinquagenarias divisi" (changing the vowels arbitrarily into חֲמִשִּׁים); Lengerke (Kenaan, p. 426): *numbered, well-organized;* "an ancient designation derived from the five fingers of the hand, after which originally all things were counted." Compare Odys. iv. 412: πάσας πεμπάζεται, *he counts all.* See also *Cusari* i. 85.

19. Moses took the bones of Joseph, i. e. probably his mummy, with him from Egypt, according to the wish of the latter, expressed to his surviving brethren before his death (Gen. l. 24, 25); and in Joshua xxiv. 32, it is faithfully recorded that the remains of their illustrious ancestor were, in accordance with his request piously handed down to the following generations by tradition, interred in the ground of Shechem, which Jacob already had bought, for himself and his descendants, as an eternal property. Since Joseph, as formerly Jacob, firmly relied on the divine promise, that the land of Canaan would be assigned to their descendants as a permanent possession, and that Egypt was only a place of temporary sojourning for them; and as the ancients, longed, even after their death, to lie in their native earth, abhorring the idea of being buried among strangers, whom they regarded either as barbarians or idolators: the commands of Jacob and Joseph, to bring their bodies back into the land of their

the people of Israel went up harnessed out of the land of Egypt. 19. And Moses took the bones of Joseph with him; for he had solemnly sworn the children of Israel, saying, God will surely [1]remember you; then you shall take my bones up hence with you. 20. And they journeyed from Succoth, and encamped in Etham, in the edge of the wilderness. 21. And the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of cloud, to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light, to go by day

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Visit.

forefathers, are expressly mentioned, and their execution is repeatedly narrated.

20. *And they journeyed from Succoth, and encamped in Etham* (באתם; Septuagint Ὀθώμ), *in the edge* (בקצה) *of the wilderness.* The situation of Etham is here described with sufficient precision. If we are compelled to suppose, as has been shown on ver. 17, that, from the commencement, the march into the Arabian desert, towards the Mount Horeb, was the design of Moses; and if, therefore, Succoth, the first station, was situated in a *south-eastern* direction from Rameses (xii. 37); Etham, in the same direction at the end of the Arabian desert, on the side of Egypt, and, therefore, near to the head of the Gulf of Suez, formed the second resting-place. The same name denoted, according to Num. xxxiii. 8, a part of the desert east of that Gulf, which is also called the desert of Shur (xv. 22), and the whole part round the extremity of the isthmus bears the common name of the desert of Dschofar (see, however, Ebn Ezra on xiv. 17). Jablonsky (Op. ii. p. 157) believes that the name Etham itself, which he thinks to be of Egyptian origin, signifies "the end of the sea" (terminus maris). Niebuhr (Des. of Arab., p. 408) considers the little fortress Adjeroud (عجرود) garrisoned with Egyptian troops, as the Etham of our text. It lies about eleven English miles north-west of the town of Suez, generally forms the third stage of the pilgrim's caravan (proceeding from Kairo to Mecca), and has copious wells of water, one of which is two hundred and fifty feet deep. Winer (Bibl. Dict. ii. p. 261) believes with Du Bois Aymé (Déscript. viii. p. 114) that the following station Pi-hahiroth, (xiv. 2), is Adjeroud (see, however, on xiv. 2). Positive identifications of ancient localities are the more precarious in this region, as it is certain that the northern part of the Gulf of Suez has formed itself, in the course of centuries, into firm land, a fact which, besides other reasons, is indisputably established by the circumstance that towns, as Muza, which are mentioned by the ancients as sea-places and harbours, are now situated in the interior of the land. The whole Gulf extended 90,000 paces, with an average breadth of 18,000 or 20,000 paces. See Déscription de l'Egypte; Mémoire sur les anciennes limites de la mer rouge, xi. p. 371, *et seq.* xviii. p. 341, *et seq.*; Niebuhr, Description of Arabia, p. 403; Ritter, Erdkunde ii. p. 232, *et seq.* But, from this point of view, a town, which lies at present eleven miles from Suez, might formerly have been situated at "the edge of the desert," but yet considerably to the west of the coast of the Gulf. "Besides," remarks Kitto, "from hence the sea is seen to make a bend to the west, and, by joining the high chain of Mount Attaka, to terminate the desert to the south."

21, 22. *God guided the Israelites in the day by a pillar of cloud and in the night by a pillar of fire.* This circumstance is here evidently reported as a miraculous interposition and special providence of

לְהָאִיר לָהֶם לָלֶכֶת יוֹמָם וָלָיְלָה׃ 22 לֹא־יָמִישׁ עַמּוּד הֶעָנָן יוֹמָם
וְעַמּוּד הָאֵשׁ לָיְלָה לִפְנֵי הָעָם׃ פ

God; and it is inadmissible to interpret it as a merely natural occurrence. Both in our passage and in many others (xiv. 19, 24; Numb. x. 34; xiv. 14; Deut. i. 33; Psa. cv. 39; Neh. ix. 12, etc.), that event is represented in such a manner that we should indeed be compelled to do violence to the text, if we attempted to draw it from the region of the miraculous. The pillars serve to the Hebrew army as a guide (Exodus xl. 36, *et seq.*) and protector (Psalm cv. 39); whenever the army encamped they stayed over the holy tent (Exod. xl. 34; Numb ix. 15); God Himself is present in them (Num. xiv. 14) and speaks out of them to Moses (Exod. xxxiii. 9; Numb. xii. 5); and the prophet Isaiah (iv. 5) sees in the protecting shadow of the pillar of cloud, and in the shining light of the pillar of fire, a symbol of the eternal presence of God, ever shielding and glorifying Zion. It is true, both our more enlightened notions regarding the providence and interference of God, and indisputable historical analogies, invite us urgently to a symbolical or rational interpretation. In the former respect Ebn Ezra already remarks: "We know that the Lord thrones in eternal majesty in heaven; but the Scriptures speak like the language of men; *because the power of God accompanied the Israelites.*" But the same interpreter is, on the other hand, so deeply convinced of the reality of the miracle, that he offers remarks on the shape of the pillars, which he says did not, like other clouds, expand to all directions, but reached like columns from heaven to earth. In the same manner fluctuates Abarbanel, who, on the one side, explains the pillars figuratively, as symbols of God's providence which went before them to ward off every evil; and, on the other side, points out the *wonder* with particular emphasis. As to the historical analogies, they are of a very varied character. Xenophon mentions in his Spartan republic, in describing the military expedition of a Spartan king, that a servant or officer, who was called *fire-bearer*, preceded the king with the fire, which had been taken from the altar, on which he had just before sacrificed at the frontier of the Spartan territory. After they had sacrificed once more, and the march had commenced, a fire which was lighted at the second sacrifice preceded the lines, without ever extinguishing. In Curtius v. 2 we read: "He (Alexander the Great) ordered a lofty pole, visible from all sides, to be raised over the general's tent, and from the top of this pole streamed a signal conspicuous everywhere to every one, *smoke by day and fire by night*" (observabatur ignis noctu, fumus interdiu). Alexander had in this, as in many other points, imitated the custom of the Persians, who, in common with most of the eastern nations, on their marches through deserted regions, bear

יד 1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 2 דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

CHAPTER XIV.

Summary.—God commands Moses to go back to the north and to encamp in Pi-hahiroth (see on ver. 1—3); Pharaoh, therefore, believing that the Israelites have lost their way in the desert, and repenting his having allowed so many useful slaves to depart, pursues them with six hundred battle-chariots and a great army. When the Israelites saw them approach towards the evening, they murmured against Moses, reproaching him with his rash and heedless plans. God, however, encouraged him with the promise of a miraculous deliverance. The pillar of cloud placed itself behind the army of Israel, and separated it during the whole night from that of the Egyptians; the one had light, whilst the other was surrounded with darkness. God now dried up the sea by a strong wind; the waves divided themselves, and stood to the right and to the left like a wall. The Egyptians pursued

and night: 22. [1]The pillar of the cloud did not cease by day, nor the pillar of fire by night, *from* before the people.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—He took not away the pillar, etc.

before the army high poles, on which iron pots are affixed, filled with lighted combustibles; so that the smoke by day, and the flame by night, signalised the way to the troops. For the sake of brevity we merely refer for further parallels to *Curtius* iii. 3; *Diod. Sic.* xvi. 66; *Clem. Alex.*, Strom. i. p. 255; *Vitringa*, Obs. SS. v. chap. 14, 16, 17. *Pitts*, Account of the Religion of the Mahometans, p. 154. *Harmar*, Obs. i. 436; Déscription de l'Egypt, viii. 128; *Bauer*, Hebr. Myth. i. 281. Thus we cannot but acknowledge a certain curious similarity between the Biblical miracle and a general military custom prevailing in the East. Under these circumstances we entirely approve of Faber's remark (Archæol. of the Hebrews, p. 244): "Both the miracle and the custom, collated and compared, give light to each other. The custom effects, that we find the miracle dignified and worthy of God; and the miracle shows, that that very custom cannot have been quite unknown to the Israelites." As the Hebrew army could by day, on account of the exceeding heat, march but little and slowly, they continued their journeys also in the cooler nights; and thus they required a guide both in the day and in the night (ללכת יומם ולילה). Which shape the pillar had, whether it was a single or a double one, whether it appeared immediately after the exodus or only after the transit over the Red Sea; these and many similar questions with which, besides a host of ancient authors, even Rosenmüller has troubled himself, are futile, and we leave them willingly to those who criticise rather from the suggestions of a lively imagination than from facts of holy or profane records. Compare also Cusari i. 97.—לַנְחֹתָם Inf. Hiph. of נָחָה instead of לְהַנְחֹתָם, as לִרְאֹתְכֶם (Deuteronomy, i. 33) instead of לְהַרְאֹתְכֶם; see note on x. 3.—About the construction הֹלֵךְ (verse 21), which participle is followed (in verse 22) by the future יָמִישׁ, on account of the negation לֹא, see note on xii. 26, 27.—יָמִישׁ future Hiph. of מוּשׁ, is, no doubt, to be taken intransitively, "to recede, to cease;" as in many other passages: Exod. xxxiii. 11 (לֹא יָמִישׁ מתוך האהל, Joshua did not depart from the tabernacle), Job xxiii. 12; Psa. lv. 12, etc. Thus it is already understood by the Septuagint (οὐκ ἐξέλιπε) and Vulgate (nunquam defuit); Targum Jonathan (לא עדי) and many others. The transitive signification, "He (God) took not away the pillar," which has been adopted by Targum Onkelos, Ebn Ezra, Rashi, Rashbam, English Version, and Mendelssohn, agrees less with the context of the preceding verse, according to which God *Himself* preceded the army in the pillar (see xiv. 19). Perhaps a double root מוּשׁ and מישׁ existed originally, like לון and לין etc.

CHAP. XIV. 1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. Speak to the children of Israel, that they [1]return, and

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Turn.

their enemies; but it was with great difficulty only that they could follow with their chariots; towards the morning their confusion became complete; they thought of return and flight. The Israelites had in the mean time accomplished the passage over the sea; when God led the waters back to their usual bed—and all the Egyptians, with their horses and chariots, found their graves in the billows. —Confidence and faith in God and His servant Moses, were, on the part of the Israelites, the immediate results of this extraordinary protection of God.

1, 2. We are accustomed to see the next movement of the Hebrews from Etham, which must have been decisive for their whole journey, so represented,

וְיָשֻׁבוּ וְיַחֲנוּ לִפְנֵי פִּי הַחִירֹת בֵּין מִגְדֹּל וּבֵין הַיָּם לִפְנֵי בַּעַל צְפֹן

that from here still the two ways were left to them, either to proceed to the north, towards the territory of the Philistines, or, declining to the south-east, to direct their march into the desert of Sinai, towards Mount Horeb (see on xiii. 17); but that, to the great surprise of the Egyptians, who no doubt carefully watched their journey, through scouts, they took neither of these two usual routes, but, in apparently inexplicable infatuation, *returned* (וישבו) to the *western* coast of the Gulf of Suez, nearer to Egypt, evidently into the very arms of their sanguinary and menacing enemies. But the absolute improbability, nay impossibility of such a route, we shall, in the course of this note, have opportunity of showing. For the explanation of our text, we remark, that the Israelites had evidently, in the precipitation of their march, advanced too far to the south; and Moses observed, with terror, that if, as was to be foreseen, they were pursued in the west by the Egyptians, the passage through the more and more widening Red Sea in the east would become impossible for them, whilst, in the south, they would be shut up by mountains and impervious passes. Moses was, therefore, compelled, at every risk, to return northwards, relying upon the existence of passable fords in the extreme part of the Gulf, if unexpected danger should threaten them from the Egyptians. It is certainly possible, as some interpreters assert, that Etham was already the *third* day's journey, and that, therefore, the Egyptians persecuted the Israelites then only, when they saw that they did not, in accordance with their pretence, sacrifice, and when it was evident that this had only been a pretext to effect their escape. But it is, on the other hand, as probable, that they made, just on the third day, that unfortunate march to the south, although the text offers no information how far they proceeded in that direction (see note on ver. 9 *sub finem*). However this may be, that backward movement of the Hebrew army naturally suggested to the Egyptians the idea: "they are entangled in the land; the wilderness hath shut them in," and enhanced their assurance to pursue the confused troops, and to force them to an ignominious return. Now it is of the highest importance, distinctly to bear in mind a circumstance, to which we have already alluded in our note on xiii. 20, that the Gulf of Suez (Heroopolites Sinus) extended, in former millenniums, considerably farther to the north (as even now, in a distance of 60,000 metres north of Suez, is found a marshy plain about 12,000 metres broad, which exhibits undeniable traces that in former ages the sea had covered this part); that therefore Etham could lie "at the end of the (Egyptian) desert," without just coinciding with the most northern point of the Gulf, and that thus the Hebrew army, having arrived at Etham, might have become aware of the danger in venturing a march so far to the south, and seen the necessity to return northwards. In harmony with these circumstances, we shall have to fix the position of this new camping-place, "before Pi-hahiroth (פי החירת), between Migdol (מגדל) and the sea, over against Baal-Zephon (בעל צפן)." Pi-hahiroth, which certainly has the sound of a Hebrew name ("entrance of passes or caverns," חור=חירה; so Saadiah, "os montium"), is probably, as Jablonsky (Op. ii. p. 159) conjectures, of Egyptian origin (πι-ΑΧΙ-ΡΩΤ), and signifies a place overgrown with reeds (ἄχι). Pi is the Egyptian article, therefore the same place is, in Numb. xxxiii. 7, 8, simply called החירת. The opinion mentioned by Rashi, that Pi-hahiroth is identical with Pithom in i. 11, deserves no notice. The Septuagint has ἀπέναντι τῆς ἐπαύλεως, as if the Hebrew text were פי העירת, which false reading is already mentioned by Jerome.—Migdol, מגדל, originally *tower* or, as an Egyptian word, "abundance of hills (*Forster*, Epist. p. 29), is, by Ezekiel (xxix. 10; xxx. 6), mentioned as a

encamp before Pi-hahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, over against Baal-Zephon: before it shall you encamp by the

northern frontier town of Egypt, over against the southern town of Syene (which, according to the Itinerar. Anton. p. 171, is twelve Roman miles from Pelusium), near which Pharaoh Necho defeated the invading Syrians (*Herod.* ii. 159). Certainly, by this general statement we gain little for the exact position of the Hebrew station. The Septuagint also renders it *Magdolon* (Μάγδωλον), a town situated near the Pelusian arm of the Nile, in Coptic *Meschtol* (ΜΕΣΧΤΟΛ), which name has preserved itself in the Arabic *Meschtul* (مشتول). But this also is much too indistinct, although the Migdol of our text might, according to our explanation, have been situated much more to the north. Hengstenberg (Moses und Ægypt. p. 58, 59) believes, therefore, that the designation "between Migdol and the sea," does not describe the exact geographical position of the place, but is only intended to point out the great danger to which the Israelites exposed themselves by encamping before Pi-hahiroth, since, probably at that time, a strong military garrison, later translocated to the neighbouring Daphne (*Herod.* ii. 30), was stationed there, and might have suddenly attacked the resting Hebrew army from the left, while the sea opposed them on the right. This supposition is, however, more ingenious than plausible. That Migdol is Mount Attaka, as Tischendorf and Kutscheit assert, is without any foundation. Niebuhr (Descr. of Arabia, p. 409) supposes it to have been near the modern Bir Suez, which is not at variance with the text.—Baal-Zephon (בעל צפן), probably the town of Typhon (צְפֹן, not *of the north*, which would be צָפֹן; so also Targum Jonathan, טעות צפן, "the idol of Typhon;" and Saadiah), who was the evil genius, or the enemy of fertility, who came in the burning wind from the desert, to destroy the creations of Osiris in the valley of the Nile (see note on ix. 10).

Baal-Zephon is, therefore, Typhonia, or according to Forster (Epist. p. 28) Heroopolis (where, as Egyptian mythology asserts, Typhon was killed by lightning), which is in Egyptian *Aouari* (ΟΥΑΡΙ, that is, producing a curse; see *Champollion*, L'Egypte sous les Phar. ii. 87), from which the Greeks seem to have made *Heroo*, adding πόλις, *town*; and the whole region in the uncultivated desert-tracts between the Nile and the Red Sea is called, "the seat of Typhon."—Now, if we combine all these statements concerning Pi-hahiroth, Migdol, and Baal-Zephon, and keep in mind the direction of the *return* above pointed out, the conjecture, that *Kolsoum* (قلزم; Greek, κλύσμα, the flood of the sea, as already Eusebius relates after ancient traditions), was the place of encampment described in our verse, or the point of passage over the Red Sea, seems perfectly plausible. About its situation says Niebuhr (Trav. i., p. 218): "In ancient times, when the ships were still enabled to come up higher in the Arabian Gulf, the town *Kolsum*, so celebrated among Arabic writers, was situated near the place, where afterwards Suez was built. Although we see here nothing but large hills of ruins, without any relics which deserve our attention; still its name has been preserved till our time, for in Suez they are still called the ruins of Kolsum." (Compare Déscript. de l'Egypte xi. 306, 366; *Quatremère*, Mémoires sur l'Eypte i. 162, *et seq.*). We know that there was, besides, another town Kolsum, more than a degree south of Suez, at the port of the mountain of the same name. But this town is here perfectly out of the question, as it is decidedly too far to the south. For already have the Israelites *returned*, that is, they have proceeded northwards; and it is impossible to suppose, that the Israelitish army strayed under the prudent leadership of Moses, heedlessly so far to the south. But the former Kol-

נִכְחוֹ תַחֲנוּ עַל־הַיָּם׃ 3 וְאָמַר פַּרְעֹה לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל נְבֻכִים הֵם

soum agrees entirely with the description of our text; for in the north, west, and south, it is surrounded by the desert, but in the east it borders on the Red Sea.— As this subject forms one of the most important and interesting points in the history of the deliverance of Israel, and as the defining of the situation of Pi-hahiroth includes at the same time the momentous question concerning the part of the Red Sea at which the Hebrew army effected the passage, we will examine here some remarks from *Kitto's* History of Palestine (i. p. 177), in which the opinion, entertained by many others, as also by Shaw (Trav. p. 269), Bruce (Trav. i. 282), Raumer, Lengerke (Ken. i. 433), Kutscheit (Leps. and the Sin.), Gerlach (ad Cap. xiv), Sicard, Joly, Monconys, Owington, Arundale, Shubert, Stephen, etc., of a considerably more *southern* position of that town is thus explained by the author: "About the head of the Gulf of Suez a desert plain extends for ten or twelve miles to west and north of the city of that name. On the west this plain is bounded by the chain of Attaka, which comes down towards the sea in a north-easterly direction. Opposite Suez this chain is seen at a considerable distance, but, as we advance southward, the mountains rapidly approach the sea, and proportionately contract the breadth of the valley; and the chain terminates at the sea, and seems, in the distant view, to shut up the valley at Ras-el-Attaka, or Cape Attaka, twelve miles below Suez. But on approaching this point, ample room is found to pass beyond; and in passing beyond we find ourselves in a broad alluvial plain, forming the mouth of the valley of Bedea. This plain is on the other or southern side nearly shut up by the termination of another chain of these mountains, which extend between the Nile and the western shore of the Red Sea. Any further progress in this direction would be impossible to a large army, especially when encumbered with flocks and herds, and with women, children, and baggage; and this from the manner, in which the rocks, the promontories, and the cliffs advance on the western shore. And, besides, any advance in this direction would be suicidal to a body desiring to escape from Egypt, as they would have the Red Sea between them and Arabia Proper, and would only get involved among the plains and valleys which separate the mountain-chains of Egyptian Arabia." — This is the decided opinion, at which the author has arrived after the fluctuating conjectures in the Pictorial Bible (pp. 168—170), from which we may, however, gather several arguments for the support of his opinion; and this will be at the same time the easiest way to refute it. Before all, we must at the very beginning emphatically protest against a supposition, which would at once stamp Moses as the most incapable and most infatuated of all military leaders. It has, as we have seen in our note on xiii. 17, always been his unshaken intention to lead the people into the Arabian desert towards Horeb; he was therefore obliged to take from Goshen the direction to south-east. Now we can well imagine, that in the unavoidable haste of the journey, he proceeded too far to the *south*, so that the sea was between his hosts and Arabia; which compelled him to return *northwards*, in order to march round the head of the Gulf—which he no doubt would have done, if he had not, by the pursuing Egyptians, been compelled to a sudden passage through the sea (as the command in xiv. 15: ויסעו, "and he shall proceed *northwards*," sufficiently shows). But it is perfectly impossible to suppose, that Moses, having once taken the right route, should intentionally and wantonly, instead of passing round the head of the Gulf into the Sinaitic peninsula, proceed southwards, through a multitude of impassable mountains, and designedly occupy a position which must almost inevitably deliver the army into the hands of their Egyptian enemies. We respect the pious

sea. 3. [1]And Pharaoh will say of the children of Israel,
They *are* entangled in the land, the wilderness hath shut

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—For.

sense, in which that hypothesis originates; for that very infatuation, so obvious and so manifest, is represented as pre-destined, in order to afford God new opportunities for mighty wonders; but even according to that theory, the Hebrew army did not give itself blindly up to a miraculous guidance, but calculated the possibilities and advantages of the different routes; for it did not proceed beyond the valley of Bedea, because "any advance in this direction would be suicidal to a body desiring to escape from Egypt." In all human calculation, *every* advance to the south, in the west of the Red Sea, was every way equally *suicidal*. Further, even if we suppose, that the Israelites proceeded, on the command of Moses, six German miles to the south of Suez—for that is the distance to Bedea—this must have been accomplished in *one* day; and it is impossible for a large and much encumbered multitude to advance at so rapid a rate. And in general, the scientific interpretation must recur to miraculous expedients, only after all attempts at a rational explanation have failed.—Further, the width of the Gulf in the south of Attaka, amounts, according to Robinson (i. 93), to three German miles; and it is impossible that so numerous a host should, in *one* night, advance such a distance; although we do not urge the circumstance, that at that point the sea is so deep, that it cannot well be dried up by a wind (ver. 21). Besides, the valley of Bedea is far too narrow and too small, to offer space for a camp to a multitude of about three millions of souls. Further, the Hebrew expression וישבו, "and they shall return," does not even admit an interpretation like that quoted above, according to which the Israelites would not have gone *back* the same way towards Egypt, on which they had proceeded before, but taken quite a *different* route to the south, without any plan or design. But in our explanation וישבו retains its literal and usual meaning.—The arguments for a more southern passage: that otherwise the Egyptians would have preferred to pass round the little way at the head of the Gulf in order to intercept the Israelites on the other, eastern coast; that in the north the sea has not water enough to drown the Egyptian army, and that it is not wide enough to hold at the same time the whole line of that army; all these, and similar arguments are of little importance, as the former nature and extent of the northern part of the Gulf of Suez, are so little known to us, and at all events, the changes which it has suffered, lead our conjectures about the situation of Pi-hahiroth, rather northwards than southwards.—The Arabian tradition mentions as the point of passage of the Israelites a great variety of names, which, however, are so little authentic, that Shaw remarks, the Bedouins point out to the travellers generally just that place, where they happen to be asked, as the locality of any ancient event. And all those names deserve, therefore, no critical examination.—About the passage itself, we refer to vers. 21, 22. On a similar basis like the opinion above analyzed, is founded the following remark of Ebn Ezra on our verse: "In truth no man, however wise, ought to search after the deeds of the Lord, for all His works are profound; and the wisdom of man is like nought before Him. And I make this observation, because it appears, that God commanded the Israelites to return, in order by this stratagem to tempt Pharaoh to pursue them, and thus to bury him and his army in the sea. For the ways of the Lord are inscrutable."

The third persons וישבו, and ויחנו, are followed by the second person, תחנו; but we see, in this change, a very usual construction "after the sense" (κατὰ σύνεσιν), without finding in it that artificial connection which Mendelssohn has pointed out, and Rosenmüller has ap-

בָּאָרֶץ סָגַר עֲלֵיהֶם הַמִּדְבָּר׃ 4 וְחִזַּקְתִּי אֶת־לֵב־פַּרְעֹה וְרָדַף
אַחֲרֵיהֶם וְאִכָּבְדָה בְּפַרְעֹה וּבְכָל־חֵילוֹ וְיָדְעוּ מִצְרַיִם כִּי־אֲנִי יְהוָה
וַיַּעֲשׂוּ־כֵן׃ 5 וַיֻּגַּד לְמֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם כִּי בָרַח הָעָם וַיֵּהָפֵךְ לְבַב פַּרְעֹה
וַעֲבָדָיו אֶל־הָעָם וַיֹּאמְרוּ מַה־זֹּאת עָשִׂינוּ כִּי־שִׁלַּחְנוּ אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל
מֵעָבְדֵנוּ׃ 6 וַיֶּאְסֹר אֶת־רִכְבּוֹ וְאֶת־עַמּוֹ לָקַח עִמּוֹ׃ 7 וַיִּקַּח שֵׁשׁ־

proved.—אמרי לי, "*of* the children of Israel;" ל, in this signification of *about, concerning*, occurs also in Gen. xx. 13: אמרי לי, *say of me* (see Rashi on that verse), etc. Onkelos, correctly, על בני ישראל, and Targum Jerusalem paraphrases, in the same sense, על עסק עמא בני ישראל.—*They are entangled in the land* (נְבֻכִים הם בארץ). נְבֻכִים, plural of Part. Niphal of the not used root בוך (instead of נְבֹכִים), to be confused, disturbed (not from נבך, as Rashbam and others propose); compare Esth. iii. 15, or, as Rashi correctly explains the verse: "they are shut up in the desert, so that they do not know how to escape from it or whither to turn;" Septuagint, πλανῶνται, they stray about; see the beginning of this note.—סגר עליהם המדבר. *The wilderness hath shut them in*; that is the mountains of the wilderness preclude their further march; or the pathless desert has so entangled them that they have lost the direction of their journey. Targ. Jonathan translates: "the idol Typhon has shut them in from the side of the desert," which strange paraphrase, it is curious to observe, has been adopted by Mendelssohn: "Baal Zephon habe die Wüste um sie her versperrt." Philippson translates: "verschlossen hat sich die Wüste vor ihnen" (the desert has shut itself before them), and remarks, that the usual translation: "the desert hath shut them in," has no sense or meaning, since the Israelites did not go at all into the desert; but in this severe stricture he forgets that it is not the *Arabian*, but the *Egyptian* desert, in which they seemed to have been hopelessly entangled.

4. *And I shall harden Pharaoh's heart.* After an interval of several days, during which the king gradually recovered from his panic and reflected on the enormity of the loss he had inflicted upon himself by dismissing so many thousand industrious labourers, his innate pride and obstinacy returned, his heart was hardened again, and the inclination of his mind was strengthened into a firm determination by the report that the Hebrew army had made movements which seemed to indicate a perfect ignorance of the territory through which they had to journey, and a cessation of the special providence and guidance which their God had hitherto manifested in their favour. Thus Pharaoh's refractoriness proceeded entirely from the perversity of his own heart; the very circumstances and events which would have reformed a less depraved mind, proved to him as inducements for new acts of pride and disobedience. We can, therefore, not admit the interpretation of those who translate here, and in ver. 8, "I shall *encourage* Pharaoh's heart," to follow his evil propensity. By this rendering, the dogmatical explanation would be rather aggravated than facilitated, whilst its lexicographical correctness is questionable.—*And I will be honoured through Pharaoh and through all his host*, that is, as the Jewish interpreters aptly explain: By punishing the wicked, God manifests to the world His justice and power, and impresses upon the nations of the earth that His mercy protects the virtuous, and His indignation chastises the insolent and the haughty, so that such acts of just retribution teach the heathens *that He is the Lord* (compare Ez. xxxviii. 22, 23; Ps. lxxvi. 2, 4). This is a far higher ground than that taken by Cahen: "According to the

them in. 4. And [1]I shall harden Pharaoh's heart, that he [2]will pursue after them; and I will be honoured through Pharaoh, and through all his army; that the Egyptians may know that I *am* the Lord. And they did so.—5. And it was reported to the king of Egypt, that the people fled: and the heart of Pharaoh and of his servants was turned against the people, and they said, Why have we done this, that we have let Israel go from serving us? 6. And he made ready his chariot, and took his people with him: 7. And he took six hundred chosen chariots, and all the chariots of Egypt, and [3]warriors in

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Will. [2] Shall. [3] Captains.

Biblical or Oriental notions, revenge taken upon the enemies is a matter of pride and glory."

5. The three days after the departure of the Israelites had elapsed, and Pharaoh, informed by his scouts that far from performing the pretended sacrifice they seemingly strayed about without a certain aim, believed now that it was perfectly certain that the people had not left the country in order to worship God, but, in fact, to escape entirely (ברח), and he strongly repented of his fatal concessions, which, although slight in themselves, threatened to deprive him of a very useful class of subjects. For the permission which he granted to the Israelites to depart, was distinctly limited to a three days' leave for the purpose of offering sacrifices, but never extended to allow their total emigration; he had clearly pronounced, "Go, serve the Lord, as you have said" (xii. 31); and therefore now, when the stratagem of the Hebrews was obvious, the heart of the king, more vividly susceptible to the faults of others than to its own wrongs, was "turned against the Israelites" (ויהפך), whilst it was formerly, at least for a short time, inclined in their favour.—אל against, = על, as in Gen. iv. 8; Numb. xxxii. 14; Josh. x. 6.

6. *And he made ready his chariot*, that is, Pharaoh *ordered* it to be done (compare 1 Kings vi. 14, ויבן), not "he did so himself in the heat and passion of his revengefulness," as Rashi, following the rabbinical interpretation, remarks.—רכבו is taken by the Septuagint collectively, τὰ ἅρματα αὐτοῦ (his chariots), that is, those of his army, which are, however, only mentioned in the following verse.

7. The use of chariots was common in Egypt from very remote periods; it is even, perhaps, one of the first countries where they were known; for Egypt was, on account of its numerous plains and the general flatness of the land, peculiarly adapted for them. A double sort of chariots was, in early times, in use: 1. The pleasure and travelling-carriages, and the transport-wagons (עגלות Gen. xlv. 19, 21, 27), and 2. The battle or war-chariots (רכב or מרכבות, xv. 4, etc; 2 Chron. xii. 3; Jer. xlvi. 9). The former kind, it is difficult, at present, clearly to describe; but the greatest probability has the supposition, that they resembled a sort of vehicles which are still used in some parts of the Orient, and which are light covered carts, without springs, called Arabah. The travelling-carriages fell, later, more and more into disuse, as the whole land was so intersected with numerous canals, that it became unsuitable for horses and carriages (*Herod.* ii. 108); and, according to the most recent travellers, even now neither wagons nor carriages are seen in Egypt (*Mayr*, ii. 40). But of the battle-chariots the old monu-

מֵאוֹת רֶכֶב בָּחוּר וְכֹל רֶכֶב מִצְרָיִם וְשָׁלִשִׁם עַל־כֻּלּוֹ׃ 8 וַיְחַזֵּק
יְהוָה אֶת־לֵב פַּרְעֹה מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם וַיִּרְדֹּף אַחֲרֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

ments offer us numerous representations, from which we learn their construction and application with sufficient clearness. It is commonly a small box, mounted on two low wheels of six generally round spokes, of such small dimensions, that it allows to the one warrior, who occupies it, scarcely more than standing room. It is generally drawn by two horses adorned with rich trappings; a third ran often at their side to be in readiness should one become disabled. The warrior in full arms (with a bow and arrows, or a javelin and a kind of reaping-hook) stood erect in his car; the reins were fastened round his waist; and he thus governed the horses by the movements of his body; and even Egyptian officers of distinction and sons of kings managed their own cars, and sought a particular fame in excelling in that art. It is, however, not improbable that these chariots had often room for two warriors (*δίφροι*), and, in the manner of the Homeric war-chariots (*ἅρματα πολεμιστήρια*, *Herod.* v. 113; *Homer*, Iliad ix. 383), or those of the Romans (which contained the bellator and the auriga), were driven by a charioteer, whilst the warrior could, with greater safety and firmness, direct his whole attention to the combat (*Herod.* v. 113; *Homer*, Iliad v. 837; ix. 383). Still in later centuries the Egyptians remained so renowned for their battle-chariots, that the Israelites, from this reason, sought their alliance against the Assyrian and Chaldean invaders (2 Kings xviii. 24; Is. xxxi. 1; Ezek. xvii. 15).—That Egypt abounded in beautiful horses is well known (see on ix. 3); according to Diodorus Siculus the Egyptian kings before Sesostris had along the banks of the Nile, between Thebes and Memphis, two hundred stables, each of which contained a hundred horses, and foreign kings enriched their studs with horses of Egyptian breed (1 Kings x. 28; 2 Chron. xiii. 3). But riding on horseback was, even many centuries later, not in use among the Egyptians; and neither the circumstance that profane writers ascribe that art to so old and genuinely an Egyptian deity as Osiris or his son Orus, nor that on ancient Egyptian paintings mounted figures are represented, prove such a custom at an earlier period; the accounts of the former are too indistinct and fabulous, and the monuments represent riders on horseback only among the enemies of the Egyptians, or among foreigners; and it is sufficient merely to mention the vague assertion of Wilkinson (Manners i. p. 289), who accounts for the omission of every notice of Egyptian cavalry on the monuments by supposing "that the artists intended to show how much more numerous the horsemen of the inimical nations were than of their own people." The expressions "chariots and *horsemen*" (Gen. l. 9), or "horse and *his rider*" (Exod. xv. 1, 21), are indistinct translations of the English Version, as will presently appear.

An organised and powerful cavalry of the Egyptian army is, therefore, in the times of Moses, out of the question; and the phrase סוס רכב, in ver. 9, is to be taken as *one* notion: a *carriage-horse*; but not "horses *and* chariots," as the Septuagint, English Version, Rosenmüller and others, render. The word רֹכֵב, in xv. 1, can, as derivative of רָכַב, very appropriately signify *chariot-warrior*. But the passage, Gen. xlix. 17, can by no consideration be adduced as a proof of the art of riding among the Egyptians, as has been done by Kitto, since it refers not to Egyptians, but to Hebrews, although then living in Egypt. For agricultural labours the horses were, according to unanimous testimonies, not used in Egypt.—As, therefore, the horses were chiefly applied for the purposes of war, especially for battle-chariots, the decay of their breeding is naturally accountable by the gradual decay of the martial spirit and of the military organization

every one of them. 8. And the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh king of Egypt, and he pursued after the children of Israel: and the children of Israel went out

of the Egyptians.—רכב בחור, "selected from all the royal chariots" (*Ebn Ezra*); וכל רכב מצרים, "and with them all the other chariots of Egypt" (*Rashi*); that is, those of private individuals. The distinction between the "chariots of Egypt" and "the selected chariots," justifies us in supposing, that the former belonged to the *guard of the king*. The existence of such a privileged body is certain, not only from testimonies of Herodotus (ii. 168), but from frequent representations on Egyptian monuments (*Rosellini*, II., iii. p. 201). They were distinguished by their arms and garments, and enjoyed peculiar privileges besides those which were common to the warrior caste. They were especially important and influential in later times, under the dynasty of the Ptolemies; they possessed the royal confidence in a high degree, and were used to the most momentous offices and commissions, especially the "chief of the guards" (ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ). The number, "six hundred chariots," must appear very moderate, and therefore trustworthy, if we consider that Diodorus of Sicily (i. 54), describes the military power of Sesostris consisting of 600,000 men infantry, 24,000 riders, *and* 27,000 *battle-chariots*.—The meaning of the word שלשם has been disputed from ancient times; and a great number of improbable or unfounded conjectures has been proposed. Targum Onkelos translates: גברין, *valiant men*, after whom Rashi renders שרי צבאות, generals; and similarly most of the ancient and modern translators. How this signification is connected with the etymology of שלש, it is difficult to see; for the opinion of Lydius, that the number three indicates the third or highest degree of comparison, so that "the third" would be identical with "the bravest," deserves no further notice; and the supposition of Ebn Ezra, that שלשם signifies men, who occupy the third rank after the king, who are therefore noble and influential individuals, is already overthrown by the one circumstance, that in 2 Kings, x. 25, the שלשם are mentioned with רצים, runners (cursores), in the suite of the king; they were, therefore, not necessarily of high rank (compare 2 Sam. xxiii. 8). The translation of the Septuagint, which has here the uncertain word τριστάτας, has rather increased than diminished the difficulty; but so much is clear, that τριστάτης does not, as Gesenius quotes after Origen, signify "a third man," because "each war-chariot carried three soldiers, one who drove the horses, and two who fought," as after the preceding remarks, the Egyptian battle-chariots never contained *three*, but generally one, and at the most, two persons. With as little propriety can the τριστάτης be compared with the *triarii* of the Roman army, who formed the third or last part of the army as reserve-troops; as such explanations would militate against the context of our verse, and of xv. 4, where שלשם is repeated.—The connection leads us rather to suppose *chariot-warriors*, who stood in these vehicles; a signification which, although it cannot be proved etymologically, is perfectly adapted to all passages, where שלשם occurs, and which has been adopted by several modern critics.

8. *And the children of Israel went out with a high hand* (ביד רמה), that is, openly, confidently and joyfully (see Num. xxxiii. 3, where it is added, by way of explanation, "before the eyes of all Egypt"), or, as Mendelssohn says: "they made themselves banners and military standards, and went out cheerfully and singing and playing on cymbals and lyres, like men who are for ever free from thraldom, not as slaves who intend to return to the old yoke." Similarly the Targumim (Jonathan: "prevailing over the Egyptians"); so also Gesenius, Rashi,

יֹצְאִים בְּיָד רָמָה׃ שני 9 וַיִּרְדְּפוּ מִצְרַיִם אַחֲרֵיהֶם
וַיַּשִּׂיגוּ אוֹתָם חֹנִים עַל־הַיָּם כָּל־סוּס רֶכֶב פַּרְעֹה וּפָרָשָׁיו וְחֵילוֹ
עַל־פִּי הַחִירֹת לִפְנֵי בַּעַל צְפֹן׃ 10 וּפַרְעֹה הִקְרִיב וַיִּשְׂאוּ בְנֵי־
יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־עֵינֵיהֶם וְהִנֵּה מִצְרַיִם ׀ נֹסֵעַ אַחֲרֵיהֶם וַיִּירְאוּ מְאֹד

and Ebn Ezra. The interpretation of ביד רמה: "by the raised powerful hand of God" (יד חזקה), who had punished the Egyptians, and intended to chastise them still more severely (so Luther, Clericus, De Wette, Winer, Glaire), neither harmonises with the parallel passage in Numbers, nor is it plausible in itself. The joyfulness and confidence of the Israelites refers to the exact time of the exodus; for, but a short time later, when the approaching Egyptians became visible (verse 10), despondency and apprehension prevailed through their hosts.

9. It cannot appear surprising, that Pharaoh was, in such a little interval, enabled to pursue the Israelites with so numerous an army, as it is well known that the warriors formed the second hereditary caste of Egypt, which was so influential that the kings were generally taken from it, and that it was alone, except the priests, allowed to acquire landed property from the principle that the occupiers of the soil are most interested in the safety of the country. Every soldier received twelve auroræ of land, free from all charge and tribute (the aurora was a square measure, containing 10,000 cubits). Besides, no civil authority had the power of arresting and imprisoning a soldier for debt (*Diod.* i. 79). Herodotus (ii. 164—168) relates that they were divided into two classes, the Hermotybies and the Calasiries, who were originally, no doubt, different tribes. Both were stationed in different nomes or districts, but almost exclusively in Lower Egypt; four-and-a-half nomes were, within the Delta, occupied by the Hermotybies, and eleven others by the Calasiries, whilst each of these classes had but one district in Middle and Upper Egypt, namely, Chemmis and Thebes. And if, as we have no reason to doubt, this distribution of the warriors was already made in ante-Mosaic times on account of the frequent invasions from Asia, the promptness with which the Egyptian army could be called out in Lower Egypt, is the easier accounted for. The Hermotybies consisted, in the time of their greatest strength, of 160,000 men; the Calasiries of 250,000. They were not allowed to learn trades, which pursuits they were accustomed to consider as undignified and unmanly, but were obliged to devote themselves exclusively to their military calling. However, as they were landed proprietors, it is very probable that, in times of peace, they engaged besides in sports of the field, and gymnastic exercises, in the occupations of agriculture, which promote the physical strength and foster habits of activity and temperance; although, according to an account of Diodorus, they were accustomed to let out their lands to husbandmen. Annually 1000 Hermotybies and Calasiries had to serve as a guard to the king; and they received, during this time, an additional allowance of meat, bread, and wine. After the lapse of one year they were relieved by others; and the neglect of this practice caused the emigration of a large portion of the warriors to Ethiopia (*Herod.* ii. 30). It appears from our note on verse 7, that the Egyptian army included well-exercised chariot-warriors, and an excellent infantry, but no considerable cavalry, at least not in earlier times. The interpretations, which would find a cavalry mentioned in our text, are incorrect; the infantry is mentioned in verse 9, וחילו. Thus the remark of Hengstenberg that, under the circumstances of a quick and sudden pursuit, the infantry could here not be applied, is unfounded.—

with a high hand. 9. But the Egyptians pursued after them, all the [1]chariot-horses of Pharaoh, and his horsemen, and his army, and overtook them encamping by the sea, beside Pi-hahiroth, before Baal-Zephon. 10. And when Pharaoh approached, the children of Israel lifted up their eyes, and, behold, the Egyptians marched after them; and they were much afraid; and the children of

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Horses *and* chariots.

It would not be unimportant with regard to the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, to know the day on which Pharaoh overtook the encamping Israelites. The sacred text offers no clue on this point; tradition fixes the day upon the 21st of Nisan, which statement Michaelis and others have tried to support, and to make plausible, by the following computation:—On the 15th day of Nisan the Israelites arrived in Succoth (xii. 37); on the 16th in Etham (xiii. 20; from Raamses to Etham is a distance of about nine German miles); on the 17th they rested in Etham; on the 18th they encamped in Pi-hahiroth (xiv. 2); on the 19th, about noon, Pharaoh marched out to pursue the Israelites, and he overtook them on the 20th, in the evening; so that the transit of the Israelites took place in the night of the 21st of Nisan. In this specification we find only this one point improbable, that the Israelites should have rested on the 17th of Nisan, under the greatest dangers; however, if we suppose, instead of this, that they on that day erroneously continued their way from Etham to the south, so that, in order not to be shut out from Arabia by the Gulf of Suez, they were compelled *to return*, and to encamp in Pi-hahiroth, we have a new illustration of our opinion concerning the situation of Pi-hahiroth and the signification of וישבו in verse 2.—סוס רכב *chariot horses* (see on verse 7); פרשים the *warriors* in the battle-chariots (Arabic فارس, one riding on, *or drawn by*, a horse); not as in 1 Kings v. 6, and Ezek. xxvii. 14, *steeds*, riding-horses.—חיל the *infantry* (Ebn Ezra רגליים), which, as has been shown, formed an important part of the Egyptian army. The Hebrew construction of this verse, which contains a somewhat unusual Metathesis, is evident from the translation. Targum Jonathan inserts here a rather long addition describing the Israelites occupied in gathering from the sea-shore precious stones and jewels, which had belonged to the drowned Egyptians.

10. *And when Pharaoh drew nigh.* The Hiphil הקריב has here an intransitive signification, as in Gen. xii. 11, etc., in common with other Hiphil forms, (for instance, השכים , הלבין , הקיץ , החריש etc., see *Gesenius*, Lehrg. p. 243; Targum Onkelos, correctly, קריב, he approached); and it is, therefore, unnecessary to supply, with Ebn Ezra, מחנהו, "he made approach *his camp*," or with Rashi, עצמו; and still less with Targum Jonathan, קרבנין, "he offered sacrifices to the idol Typhon."—When the Israelites saw the approach of the Egyptian army, *they were very much afraid.* Ebn Ezra aptly remarks on ver. 13: "It is very surprising that such a large army, consisting of 600,000 men, should be so terrified by an approaching enemy, and that they did not fight for their own lives and for their wives and children. But our astonishment ceases if we consider that the Egyptians had been the lords of the Hebrews, and that that generation, which had just departed from Egypt, had learned from their youth to respect the Egyptians as their superiors, and patiently to endure all insults which they inflicted upon them; thus had their minds become depressed and servile, and how could they now fight against their masters? Besides,

וַיִּצְעֲקוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־יְהוָה׃ 11 וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֶל־מֹשֶׁה הֲמִבְּלִי אֵין־
קְבָרִים בְּמִצְרַיִם לְקַחְתָּנוּ לָמוּת בַּמִּדְבָּר מַה־זֹּאת עָשִׂיתָ לָּנוּ
לְהוֹצִיאָנוּ מִמִּצְרָיִם׃ 12 הֲלֹא־זֶה הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְנוּ אֵלֶיךָ
בְמִצְרַיִם לֵאמֹר חֲדַל מִמֶּנּוּ וְנַעַבְדָה אֶת־מִצְרָיִם כִּי טוֹב לָנוּ עֲבֹד
אֶת־מִצְרַיִם מִמֻּתֵנוּ בַּמִּדְבָּר׃ 13 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־הָעָם אַל־תִּירָאוּ
הִתְיַצְּבוּ וּרְאוּ אֶת־יְשׁוּעַת יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲשֶׂה לָכֶם הַיּוֹם כִּי אֲשֶׁר
רְאִיתֶם אֶת־מִצְרַיִם הַיּוֹם לֹא תֹסִפוּ לִרְאֹתָם עוֹד עַד־עוֹלָם׃ 14 יְהוָה
יִלָּחֵם לָכֶם וְאַתֶּם תַּחֲרִשׁוּן׃ פ שלישי

the Israelites were weak and not experienced in the practices of war. They could not even combat against the Canaanitish tribes till the following generation had grown up, which had not sighed under the foreign servitude, and which was bolder and more high-spirited." This idea of Ebn Ezra has been still further developed by Mendelssohn. Besides, the Hebrews were, undoubtedly, not provided with battle-chariots, and, in general, not so well equipped as the Egyptians. But experience in the use of arms it was almost impossible for the Hebrews to possess, as in Egypt those only who belonged to the warrior caste, were permitted to wear arms. It may be a very wise and beneficial law, which forbids to wear arms in the streets; but it is scarcely a proof of so exalted a degree of civilisation and political order, as Wilkinson finds in that prohibition (*Manners*, i. pp. 347, 402, *et seq.*). A state may be perfectly despotical, the personal liberty of the citizens may be completely fettered, and such a law might yet be enforced, as is, indeed, even at the present day, in many absolute and autocratic governments. Despotism has, in fact, the very greatest interest in making the *citizens* forget the use of arms.—*And the children of Israel cried* (ויצעקו) *to the Lord;* that is, partly in prayer (*Jonathan*, וצלו, as in ver. 15), partly in agitation and murmuring (Onkelos, וזעיקו; compare Nehem. v. 1). Certainly those who are in this verse represented as *crying*, are the same who, in the following, assail Moses with reproaches; so that the translation of Targum Jonathan "and the wicked of that generation said to Moses," is quite arbitrary. In ver. 13 and 14, the same paraphrast divides even the Israelites into four classes: those who wish to return to Egypt, those who are eager to fight against the Egyptians, etc.

11, 12. *Because there were no graves in Egypt hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness?* המבלי אין, is a pleonastic or double negation, which enhances its emphasis, exactly as in Greek, *οὐ μή, οὐκ οὐδείς, οὐκ οὐδαμοῦ, οὐ...οὔτε...οὔτε*, etc., and not, as in Latin, where two negations are equivalent to an affirmative (and even in Greek, in some cases, as *οὐδεὶς ὅστις οὐ*, nemo non); compare 1 Kings x. 21, אין כסף לא נחשב; and 2 Chron. ix. 20, אין כסף נחשב; see Isa. v. 9; Jer. x. 6, 7. Ebn Ezra compares the similar phrase הרק אך, in Numb. xii. 2; and Rashi translates: "est-ce pour faillance de nos fosses?" Mendelssohn, aptly: "Ist es aus Mangel an Gräbern, dass etwa keine in Ægypten sind?" Very artificial is the opinion of those who, like Abarbanel, overlooking this Hebraism, deduce from that double negation the following sense: "Hast thou perhaps thought that they would, after our death, *bury* us in Egypt, on account of the purity of the land, and hast, therefore, from malice and hatred against us, led us into the desert, that we

Israel cried to the Lord. 11. And they said to Moses, Because *there were* no graves in Egypt, hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness? Wherefore hast thou done thus to us, to lead us forth out of Egypt? 12. *Is* not this the word that we spoke to thee in Egypt, saying, Let us alone, that we may serve the Egyptians? For *it* [1]*is* better for us to serve the Egyptians, than that we should die in the wilderness. 13. And Moses said to the people, Fear ye not, stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord, which He will show to you to day: [2]for as you have seen the Egyptians to-day, you shall see them again no more for ever. 14. The Lord will fight for you, and you shall keep yourselves quiet.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Had been. [2] For the Egyptians, whom you have seen to-day, etc.

may lie here *unburied?*—לקחתנו; Sept. correctly, ἐξήγαγες ἡμᾶς. Although the text does not mention similar remonstrances of the Israelites before the exodus, the preceding narrative offers more than one allusion to the resistance which the despondency and the disbelief of the Israelites opposed to his plans, as in vi. 9: "They did not listen to Moses;" or, v. 21: "The Lord may look upon you and judge." As faint reminiscences, and fluctuating traditions from past centuries, were the only bonds by which the vast numbers of the Israelites were feebly connected; as, further, the tyrannical measures of the Pharaohs had perfectly attained their aim in making the Israelites indifferent, and deadened to all higher interests—for this large population did not even attempt a revolt against their oppressors—and as political independence was an idea which they had neither inherited from their ancestors, nor had themselves practically acquired: the miraculous interposition of God, which, working through the agency of Moses, had effected their release, had only silenced, not extirpated their doubts and their reluctance; and now, when they saw themselves in an endless, dreary and trackless wilderness, in which they must, even under the most favourable circumstances, expect all the horrors of famine, and when, to complete their consternation, they beheld their mortal enemies wrathfully follow behind them, and the foaming sea wildly rage before them: was it not natural that the people, forgetting a feeling of honour which had as yet taken no root in their minds, wished longingly to return to the old yoke of servitude, to the miseries and humiliations to which long habit had almost reconciled them, and in which their daily wants were, at least, tolerably provided for?

13, 14. Moses calms the desponding Israelites; but still without severity or censure: they must, in this apparently desperate situation, not rely upon their own strength, but upon the help of God, who would combat for them, without the least co-operation on their part.—*For as you see the Egyptians to-day, you shall see them again no more for ever.* Thus we render this passage, taking אשר like כאשר, as Targum. Onkelos (כמא), the Septuagint (ὃν τρόπον), Rosenmüller, and others. Against the usual translation ("The Egyptians, whom you have seen to-day, you shall see them again no more") the following arguments can be urged: 1. That the relative אשר would, against the Hebrew usage, stand before

15 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה מַה־תִּצְעַק אֵלָי דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל
וְיִסָּעוּ׃ 16 וְאַתָּה הָרֵם אֶת־מַטְּךָ וּנְטֵה אֶת־יָדְךָ עַל־הַיָּם וּבְקָעֵהוּ
וְיָבֹאוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּתוֹךְ הַיָּם בַּיַּבָּשָׁה׃ 17 וַאֲנִי הִנְנִי מְחַזֵּק
אֶת־לֵב מִצְרַיִם וְיָבֹאוּ אַחֲרֵיהֶם וְאִכָּבְדָה בְּפַרְעֹה וּבְכָל־חֵילוֹ
בְּרִכְבּוֹ וּבְפָרָשָׁיו׃ 18 וְיָדְעוּ מִצְרַיִם כִּי־אֲנִי יְהוָה בְּהִכָּבְדִי בְּפַרְעֹה
בְּרִכְבּוֹ וּבְפָרָשָׁיו׃ 19 וַיִּסַּע מַלְאַךְ הָאֱלֹהִים הַהֹלֵךְ לִפְנֵי מַחֲנֵה
יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֵּלֶךְ מֵאַחֲרֵיהֶם וַיִּסַּע עַמּוּד הֶעָנָן מִפְּנֵיהֶם וַיַּעֲמֹד מֵאַחֲרֵיהֶם׃
20 וַיָּבֹא בֵּין ׀ מַחֲנֵה מִצְרַיִם וּבֵין מַחֲנֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהִי הֶעָנָן וְהַחֹשֶׁךְ

its corresponding substantive. 2. That the suffix in לראתם shows, that מצרים, to which word it refers, does not belong to the same principal sentence, although the suffix is sometimes used pleonastically, if the accusative precedes the nomen regens. Further, 3. such idea would militate against history and against the spirit of the Mosaic legislation: for the connection of the Israelites with the Egyptians was, in later times also, especially in the epoch of the Hebrew monarchy, vividly entertained; and Moses facilitated the admission of the Egyptians into the Hebrew community by special precepts (see note on xxii. 20). Therefore, the assertion of Philippson: "that this was the complete act of separation between the tyrannical Egyptians and the enthralled Israelites, and thus their connection was entirely and for ever dissolved," is but partially true.—But on the other hand, it is perfectly correct, that the Israelites saw the Egyptians no more *so* as they beheld them on that day; by a special providence in favour of the Israelites, the flower of their army was destroyed, and they were deeply humiliated before all the nations of the earth.—Vater refers אשר not very convincingly to the Israelites.—*And you shall be quiet*, which very emphatical expression can signify either, with respect to ver. 10: you shall desist from your clamouring and mourning; or more probably: you may quietly and confidently trust in the assistance of God, who will fight your combats לכם, *for* you (*Rashi* בשבילכם); ל, in this signification also in Judges vi. 31; Job xiii. 8.

15—18. God repeats to Moses the promise of a happy deliverance from the pursuing Egyptians (ver. 4), now stating the manner of this rescue, that He will divide the sea before the Israelites, and lead them as through dry land, whilst He would immerse the whole Egyptian army in its depths.—*And the Lord said to Moses, Wherefore criest thou to me?* which is by Targum Onkelos thus incorrectly rendered: "I have heard thy prayer"; and Rashi infers from it, that Moses, although consoling and encouraging the Israelites, yet sought internal fortitude by prayer, which the Syriac version really adds. Natural and probable as is this opinion, it is questioned by Ebn Ezra, who believes, that Moses is here named only as the representative of the people of Israel; which would be plausible only on the supposition that the Israelites also invoked God's assistance.—*That they go forward*, "to the coast of the sea," says Ebn Ezra; but it is unquestionably more probable, that Moses, as a cautious leader, in this critical moment, proceeded further *northwards*, where the passage was much easier and safer, even in the case that they should not succeed to pass round the head of the Gulf (see on xiv. 1—3).—Moses is commanded "to lift up the staff, and to stretch out his hand over the sea,"

15. And the Lord said to Moses, Wherefore criest thou to me? Speak to the children of Israel, that they go forward: 16. And lift thou up thy [1]staff, and stretch out thy hand over the sea, and divide it: and the children of Israel shall go on dry ground through [2]the sea. 17. And I, behold, I shall harden the hearts of the Egyptians, and they will follow them: and I will be honoured through Pharaoh, and through all his host, through his chariots, and through his horsemen. 18. And the Egyptians shall know that I *am* the Lord, when I have been honoured through Pharaoh, through his chariots, and through his horsemen. 19. And the angel of God, who went before the camp of Israel, [3]withdrew, and went behind them; and the pillar of cloud withdrew from before their face, and stood behind them: 20. And it came between the camp

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Rod. [2] The midst of the sea. [3] Removed.

analogous to similar symbolical acts performed at the Egyptian plagues (compare note on ix. 10). For it was not the staff which divided the sea; but, according to ver. 21, God kept back the waters by a strong east-wind; although this began to blow the moment when Moses lifted up his staff.—*Through the sea* (בתוך הים), not exactly through *the midst* of the sea (εἰς μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης), but they crossed it at that very point, on which they happened to be at the beginning of the evening.—About ואכבדה בפרעה, see on ver. 4; and about חיל , רכב and פרשים, on ver. 9.

19, 20. In order to enable the Israelites to effect the passage over the Red Sea during the night, in safety and without danger of being attacked or pressed on by the Egyptians, both armies were divided by the pillar of cloud, which passed between them, so that they did not touch each other during the night; and in order to enhance the protection of the one, and the confusion of the other, the former were surrounded by shining light, the latter by deep darkness. Now those, who suppose that the pillar of cloud and that of fire were two distinct columns, follow the opinion of Rashbam and of others, that the pillar of fire spread light before the army of the Israelites as usually in all nights, whilst the pillar of cloud stood behind them, and before the Egyptians, causing darkness to the latter. But those, who believe that both were but one and the same pillar, accede to the opinion of Targum Jonathan, that it divided itself into a bright and dark half, the former of which shone cheeringly upon the path of the Israelites, whilst the latter benighted the ranks of the Egyptians; or, as Maurer explains, it appeared dark to the Egyptians, but bright to the Israelites; so that הענן והחשך would be a Hendiadys, "a dark cloud" (nubes tenebricosa; so also Vulgate, Luther, and others).—This is the general clear sense of these verses, which several ancient translators render rather obscurely and confusedly, especially the words: ויהי הענן והחשך ויאר את־הלילה, for instance, the Septuagint, *καὶ ἐγένετο σκότος καὶ γνόφος, καὶ διῆλθεν ἡ νύξ*; Vulgate, without meaning: "et erat nubes tenebrosa et illuminans noctem"; so also Luther: "es war aber eine finstere Wolke und erleuchtete die Nacht," and others. However, already the Targumim, Symmachus, Rashi, and Ebn Ezra, have found the

וַיָּאֶר אֶת־הַלָּיְלָה וְלֹא־קָרַב זֶה אֶל־זֶה כָּל־הַלָּיְלָה׃ 21 וַיֵּט מֹשֶׁה
אֶת־יָדוֹ עַל־הַיָּם וַיּוֹלֶךְ יְהוָה ׀ אֶת־הַיָּם בְּרוּחַ קָדִים עַזָּה כָּל־
הַלַּיְלָה וַיָּשֶׂם אֶת־הַיָּם לֶחָרָבָה וַיִּבָּקְעוּ הַמָּיִם׃ 22 וַיָּבֹאוּ בְנֵי־
יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּתוֹךְ הַיָּם בַּיַּבָּשָׁה וְהַמַּיִם לָהֶם חוֹמָה מִימִינָם וּמִשְּׂמֹאלָם׃

correct interpretation. Compare Joshua xxiv. 7.—But certainly the text narrates a miraculous fact, and it is futile to explain it naturally, as, for instance, Vater has attempted to do, in the following manner: "We can represent to ourselves the circumstance, so that the vapour, which might easily have been increased by lighting still more combustibles, was, by the strong wind, driven upon the Egyptians, whilst the Israelites had the flame before them; and that the former beheld towards the morning the red reflex of the flame breaking through the vapour; and believed it in their consternation to be a sign of the presence of God." The precarious character of such conjectures is self-evident.—As God or His angel was in the cloud (see xiii. 21, 22), the one recedes, when the other goes back; and therefore the phrases: "the angel of God withdrew," and "the pillar of cloud withdrew" (in ver. 19) appear to be synonymous.

21, 22. In these two verses the memorable and miraculous passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea is related in simple and clear words, and yet not without poetical grace. As in all the wonders of Egypt (see p. 118), this also, the greatest of all (קריעת ים סוף, the division of the Red Sea), is based upon a natural cause, and in this the boundless power of God, who, by an insignificant change, knows how to convert the natural and common course of things into extraordinary and marvellous events, is sublimely manifest. And, in this sense, Rashbam observes: "God acted in the usual way, for the wind dries up and coagulates the rivers;" and Ebn Ezra mentions, with particular stress, that the wind did not cease to blow during the *whole* night, even not at the time of the passage itself (compare also *Midr. Beresh. Rabb.* ad Gen. i. 9: יקוו המים). It is *a strong east-wind* (רוח קדים עזה), which produces the drying-up of the sea, and "divides the waters;" for storms work at all times similar effects, although in an infinitely more limited degree; and the prophet Hosea (xiii. 15) says, with a similar metaphor: "an east-wind shall come, the wind of the Lord (that is, a strong wind) and his spring shall cease to flow, and his fountain shall be dried up." The term רוח קדים, however, is not, necessarily, the *east*-wind, which would just have driven the waves into the faces of the Israelites, who stood at the western coast, but only a *strong, vehement* wind, from whatever part it may blow; and, in this sense of a violent, destructive tempest, רוח קדים is used in many other Biblical passages, for instance, Psalm xlviii. 8; Ezek. xxvii. 26; Job xxvii. 21; Jer. xviii. 17; Isaiah xxvii. 8. The Septuagint translates here, as in x. 13 (which see) νότος, *south*-wind, and the Vulgate, "ventus urens," a burning wind, which dried up the sea by heat. But both versions are against our text. To take רוח קדים as the north-east wind (as Clericus, Vater, and others do) is not inadmissible, but unnecessary. In fact, no individual wind applies exactly to the description of the text; for the sea made a dry path from west to east, and from *both sides* of it, to the right and to the left, the waters formed a wall (חומה), which sense is still more poetically expressed in xv. 8: "the floods stood upright like a *mound*" (נֵד). In these phrases, the word *wall* is not exactly intended to convey the idea of *protection* (as Michaelis believes), but only of hardness and solidity, into which the fluid was converted. More clearly than in our text,

of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud of darkness *to them*, but it gave light by night *to these:* so that the one came not near the other all the night. 21. And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea; and the Lord caused the sea to go *back* by a strong east-wind all that night, and made the sea dry *land*, and the waters were divided. 22. And the children of Israel went [1]through the sea upon the dry *ground:* and the waters *were* a wall to them on their right hand and on

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Into the midst of the sea.

the similar miracle of the passage of the Jordan is related in Joshua iii. 13, 16, where also the expression נֵד *wall*, is used of the erect floods. Clericus and others take the words חומה and נֵד quite figuratively, so that they signify merely, that the waters receded and formed low fords. But the expressions "wall" or "mound" cannot possibly stand, by way of metaphor, for a thing which has not the remotest internal connection with them; they are evidently meant to represent a miraculous stand-still of the waves on both sides of the marching Israelites; which idea is expressly urged in Psalm lxxviii. 13, as a great wonder, with the same word נד (בקע ים ויעבירם ויצב מים כמו נד); whereas that explanation would, contrary to the intention of the author, disavow the miracle. We have already, in our notes on verses 1—3, refuted the conjecture, that the point of passage was as far to the south as Bedea, and have declared ourselves in favour of Kolsoum, which was situated near the present Suez, and with which both the sacred text and the circumstances of the event harmonise. On this point the sea is only 757 double paces broad; and the Hebrew army could well journey this distance within six or seven hours, from the evening to the morning watch; and it is unnecessary to recur, as Eichhorn, Rosenmüller, and others do, to the conjecture that a large portion of the people had already reached the eastern coast of the Gulf before that time; a supposition quite untenable, and in no way justified by our text. Further, after the testimony of Niebuhr (Descr. of Arabia, p. 412), the bed of the sea is in this part sandy, and, therefore, easily passable, and not slimy or covered with corals, which are very numerous in the southern part. Besides, the water is here free from sea-weeds, which, in more southern sections, considerably aggravate the passage, and render a *quick* march impossible (see *Forskal*, Flora Ægypt., p. 83; *Niebuhr*, *loc. cit.* p. 417).

The extraordinary narrowness of the Gulf of Suez, which appears here like a river, has been noticed both by ancient and modern geographers, Strabo, Diodorus Siculus, Niebuhr and others. The sea has, in fact, on this point been crossed by others also, although with great danger; so by Christopher Furer and Jacob Beyer, from Nürnberg, in November, 1565; by Niebuhr, on horseback, in September, 1762, whilst Arabs accompanied him on foot; by Napoleon, in the year 1798, also on horseback, but who narrowly escaped; and by several others (see *Büsching*, Description of Asia, p. 471). In general, passages over the sea, even with armies, are not without parallel; thus narrates Strabo (xiv. 2. § 9) concerning Alexander the Great: "About Phaselis is that narrow passage by the sea-side through which Alexander led his army. For Mount Klimax, which adjoins to the Pamphylian coast, leaves, near the shore, a narrow passage, which, in calm weather, is bare, so as to be passable by travellers, but which is quite covered with water when the sea

23 וַיִּרְדְּפוּ מִצְרַיִם וַיָּבֹאוּ אַחֲרֵיהֶם כֹּל סוּס פַּרְעֹה רִכְבּוֹ וּפָרָשָׁיו
אֶל־תּוֹךְ הַיָּם׃ 24 וַיְהִי בְּאַשְׁמֹרֶת הַבֹּקֶר וַיַּשְׁקֵף יְהוָה אֶל־מַחֲנֵה

overflows. Now then, the ascent by the mountain is very circuitous and laborious; Alexander arrived there in a stormy season, but, as he mostly relied upon his good fortune, he commenced the march before the sea had retired, and his soldiers were obliged to journey a whole day through the water, which reached to the navel." This fact, which Alexander himself describes in his letters as plain and natural, has, by later writers, as Arrian (i. p. 53, Ed. Gron.), Appian (ii. p. 522, Ed. Toll.), Menander and others, been drawn into the sphere of the miraculous, and represented as an extraordinary occurrence (see *Plutarch*, Alex. xx). To that fact Josephus also alludes, in a passage which is, besides, remarkable in other respects. He writes, in his Antiq. II. xvi. 5: "As for myself, I have delivered every part of this history as I found it in the sacred books; nor let any one wonder at the strangeness of the narration, if a way was discovered, even through the sea, by those men of ancient times, who were free from wickedness, whether it happened by the will of God, or whether it happened of its own accord, since, for the sake of those who accompanied Alexander, king of Macedonia, who yet lived, comparatively, but a little while ago, the Pamphylian Sea retired, and afforded them a passage through itself, when they had no other way to go, I mean, when it was the will of God to destroy the monarchy of the Persians; and this is confessed to be true by all who have written about the actions of Alexander. But, as to these events, let every one determine as he pleases" (*περὶ μὲν οὖν τούτων ὡς ἑκάστῳ δοκεῖ διαλαμβανέτω*). Further, Livy (xxvi. 45) narrates, about Scipio Africanus: "When he learnt that the ebb was approaching, and that he could, from the sea-side, easily reach the walls (of Carthago Nova), he led his troops thither. It was about the middle of the day, and, besides the ebb, a heavy north-wind arose, and the sea became so low that the water reached, at some places, only to their navels, at others, scarcely to their knees. Scipio represented this circumstance, which he had discovered by attention and reflection, as a miracle, and ascribed it to the gods, who, in order to prepare a passage for the Romans, had ordered the sea to retire, and opened paths never before trodden by human feet; he, therefore, commanded his troops to follow Neptune as the guide of their way, and to proceed to the walls through the midst of the low water." Dr. E. D. Clarke (Travels, i. p. 324) writes: "A remarkable phenomenon occurs in the Sea of Azof during violent east-winds: the sea retires, in so singular a manner, that the people of Tanganrog are able to effect a passage upon dry land to the opposite coast, a distance of twenty versts, equal to fourteen miles; but when the wind changes, and this it sometimes does very suddenly, the waters return with such rapidity to their wonted bed that many lives are lost. The depth here is five fathoms." See also Plutarch, in the Life of Lucullus, cap. 24, about his passage over the Euphrates, on which the natives of the country looked with astonishment as upon a miracle.—However, in spite of all these analogies, we cannot accede to the usual supposition, which has, since many centuries, been zealously advocated, that Moses also availed himself of the *ebb* to lead the Israelites over the Red Sea; for, it is asserted, that his long sojourn in those regions must have made him acquainted with the regularly returning tides; and thus the history of the passage would be deprived of every miraculous element, and would simply become a natural event. But, although both ancient and modern writers confirm the considerable ebbs at the Red Sea, the following facts militate against such conjecture: 1st. The holy text makes no

their left. 23. And the Egyptians pursued, and went in after them into the sea, all Pharaoh's horses, his chariots, and his horsemen. 24. And it came to pass, that in the morning watch the Lord looked upon the host of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and of the cloud, and

allusion whatever to ebb or flood; on the contrary, the description of the event, "that the waters of the sea stood like a wall to the right and to the left," utterly excludes such interpretation; 2nd. According to the *spirit* of our narrative, evidently no natural event is related, but an extraordinary miracle, to which the later Hebrew historians, poets and prophets, incessantly refer, as the greatest act of God's special providence in favour of Israel, and it would require nothing less than a contortion of the whole Biblical literature if it were attempted to argue away that miracle (compare Exod. xv. 14—19; Ps. lxvi. 6; lxxvii. 17; lxxviii. 13; cvi. 9; cxiv. 3; Josh. iv. 23, etc). 3rd. Even the Egyptians acknowledge (ver. 25) the miraculous character of this event; 4th. The ebb lasts only so short time that the whole army would not safely have reached the opposite coast, without being overtaken by the returning flood (compare *Herod.* ii. 11; *Diod. Sic.* iii. 15, 19), and the supposition of Michaelis, that a *double ebb* took place just in that night, as that on the Dutch coast, in June 1672, would imply quite as great a miracle as that which it is intended to remove. Then, to sum up this subject, although a passage through the Red Sea in the neighbourhood of Kolsoum, in a natural way, is not quite impossible, and has, indeed, several times been effected in later periods; it was yet, according to the holy text, executed under so extraordinary circumstances that the literal sense of our narrative shows, unmistakably, that it is intended to describe here a miracle. (Copious remarks on this important and interesting subject will be found in the following works: *Clericus*, De Maris Idumaei Trajectione, in the Appendix to his Commentary on the Pentateuch; *Niebuhr*, Descript. of Arab. pp. 409—414; *Eichhorn*, Biblioth. of Bibl. Liter. i. p. 663, *et seq.*; *Dœderlein*, Fragments, i. p. 77—112; *Michaelis*, Miscellan. Little Treatises, Part I). Profane writers also mention the drying out of the sea, and the transit of the Israelites; thus, according to Diodor. (iii. 39), the Ichthyophagi, a poor and not very numerous tribe in the east of the Gulf of Suez, have preserved the tradition, that "by a great ebb once the whole Gulf became dry, the waters gathered on the opposite side, so that the bottom was visible; but then a violent flood filled up the bed again." On the account of Artapanus, see in the Introduction, § 3. iv.

23. The Egyptians, either seeing the dry path of the sea, or (as Abarbanel believes) surrounded by darkness (ver. 20), not perceiving at all that the Israelites effected their passage over the dry bed of the waves, followed them in blind fury; in the former case, hoping to share the miracle wrought in favour of the Israelites; in the other alternative, not even aware of the imminent danger, into which they madly plunged; and thus all their horses, chariots, and warriors ran into their destruction.

24. *And it came to pass in the morning watch* (באשמרת הבקר). Like all nations which calculate after the course of the moon (as the Arabians, Greeks, Gauls, and others), the Hebrews reckoned the civil day from sunset to sunset (Lev. xxiii. 32; νυχθήμερον. "Nox ducere diem videtur," *Tacitus*, German. xi. See also *Pliny*, Hist. Nat. ii. 79). The division of the natural *day* into twelve hours, which were in the different seasons of unequal length (as among the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans), seems to have been adopted by the Israelites not earlier than in the

מִצְרַיִם בְּעַמּוּד אֵשׁ וְעָנָן וַיָּהָם אֵת מַחֲנֵה מִצְרָיִם׃ 25 וַיָּסַר אֵת אֹפַן
מַרְכְּבֹתָיו וַיְנַהֲגֵהוּ בִּכְבֵדֻת וַיֹּאמֶר מִצְרַיִם אָנוּסָה מִפְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי
יְהוָה נִלְחָם לָהֶם בְּמִצְרָיִם׃ פ רביעי
26 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה נְטֵה אֶת־יָדְךָ עַל־הַיָּם וְיָשֻׁבוּ הַמַּיִם עַל־
מִצְרַיִם עַל־רִכְבּוֹ וְעַל־פָּרָשָׁיו׃ 27 וַיֵּט מֹשֶׁה אֶת־יָדוֹ עַל־הַיָּם וַיָּשָׁב

time of the exile, when they followed their Babylonian masters (Herod. ii. 109). The hours were counted from sunrise; the first corresponded with our sixth in the morning; the sixth to our twelfth. The longest day in Palestine lasts fourteen hours and twelve minutes; the shortest, nine hours forty-eight minutes. The *night* was divided into "watches," that is, into sections after the lapse of which the watch was relieved. Before the exile three such watches were in use among the Hebrews: 1. ראש אשמרות (Lament. ii. 19), the first watch of the night, from about six to ten in the evening; 2. אשמרת התיכונה (Judg. vii. 19), the middle watch, from ten to two o'clock in the night; and 3. אשמרת הבקר (here and in 1 Sam. xi. 11), from about two to six in the morning, or to the morning-dawn; and as the exodus of the Israelites took place at the beginning of April (see note on xii. 2), sunrise was about six o'clock in the morning.—But later, in the time of Christ, the Israelites had, after the custom of the Romans, four watches of about three hours each: 1. ὀψέ; 2. μεσονύκτιον; 3. ἀλεκτοροφωνία; and 4. πρωΐ. (See *Kimchi* on Ps. lxiii. 7; *Rashi* on Judg. vii. 19; and *De Wette*, Arch. § 181).—*And the Lord looked upon the host of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and of the cloud.* God cast a glance of indignation on the pursuing refractory idolators, and He thus *confounded* them (ויהם from המם, to disturb).—Similar metaphors derived from the "wrathful eye" of the Lord occur also in Amos ix. 4; Ps. civ. 32, etc. Our text describes merely the sudden consternation of the Egyptians, and points to God as the author of this horror, without in the least alluding to the means, by which that unexpected panic was produced. Tradition believes thunder and lightning, together with earthquake and torrents of rain to have been the cause of the confusion; and already in the Psalms (lxxvii. 18, 19) the event is thus represented: "The clouds poured out water; the skies sent out a sound; Thy arrows also were darted. The voice of Thy thunder was in the whirlwind; the lightnings illumined the world; the earth trembled and shook," and similarly Targ. Jonathan and Jerusalem, which opinion is also followed by Ebn Ezra, Rashi, Rashbam, and others, and even by modern interpreters; and Josephus also (Antiq. II. xvi. 3) writes: "Showers of rain came down from the sky, and dreadful thunders and lightning, with flashes of fire; thunder-bolts also were darted upon them; nor was there anything which used to be sent by God upon men, as indications of His wrath, which did not happen at this time."—We repeat, that our text offers no hint concerning these or similar phenomena.—מחנה (from חנה to encamp), originally *camp*, here *army*, as in Judg. iv. 16, etc.—God, "who was in the pillar of fire and of cloud," confounded the Egyptian army.

25. *And He made their chariot-wheels glide out* (ויסר) *and led them on with difficulty.* Many different explanations of the word ויסר have been proposed; but if we follow the construction and context without artificial efforts, we arrive simply at the following sense: God brought confusion over the Egyptians; for, eager as they were to pursue the Israelites, their chariots could not move on the slippery bottom of the sea, as if

[1]confounded the host of the Egyptians; 25. And [2]made
glide out their chariot-wheels, [3]and led them on with diffi-
culty; so that the Egyptians said, Let us flee from before
Israel; for the Lord fighteth for them against the Egyp-
tians.—26. And the Lord said to Moses, Stretch out thy
hand over the sea, that the waters may [4]return upon the
Egyptians, upon their chariots, and upon their horsemen.
27. And Moses stretched forth his hand over the sea, and

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Troubled. [2] Took off. [3] That they drave them heavily. [4] Come again.

by higher interposition; they glided incessantly out or back; and thus the Egyptian chariot-army went but slowly and *heavily* on, whilst the Israelites, mostly on foot, reached the opposite coast with rapid steps.—The translation of ויסר almost generally adopted is: "and He *took off* their chariot wheels"; thus Onkelos, Ebn Ezra, Rashi (who ascribes these destructive effects to the lightning, which struck also the bodies of the warriors), Luther, Mendelssohn, and others. But if the wheels of the chariots were *broken off*, God did not lead them on *with difficulty* or slowly, but the chariots would not have moved on at all; at least, the Egyptians would have at once and entirely abandoned the war-chariots without wheels, as perfectly unfit either for pursuit or combat.—The Septuagint translates: *καὶ συνέδησε τοὺς ἄξονας τῶν ἁρμάτων αὐτῶν, καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτοὺς μετὰ βίας*, "and he tied up the axles of their chariots, and led them on with force," in which version not only ויסר is arbitrarily rendered by *binding* or *fastening*, as if the text were ויאסר, which reading, indeed, the Samaritan Codex offers, but the suffix in וינהגהו seems incorrectly to be referred to אפן, whilst it applies to מחנה, the Egyptian army; into which mistake, besides others, the English Version also has fallen, translating with a change of the subjects: "so that *they* drove *them* heavily."—Certainly, the general sense of the words, "and *He tied up* the wheels," if taken figuratively for, "He arrested them," is on the whole correct.—Maurer translates ויסר, "and He made go astray," analogous with Deut. vii. 4, which is grammatically not inadmissible, but which would imply a new and extraordinary miracle, since the Egyptians saw the Israelites near before their eyes.—Still less tenable is the conjecture of those, who translate ויסר with *to turn*, so that the sense would be: the Egyptians tried in their terror to turn round and to fly, but they felt themselves prevented by some invisible power to execute their intention (so *Rashbam*): which is contrary to the whole context.—The translation of the Vulgate also, which renders the words וינהגהו בכבדת with "ferebanturque in profundum" (and they were hurled into the depth) is perfectly incorrect and arbitrary.—*And the Egyptians* (מִצְרַיִם) *said, Let us flee before Israel, for the Lord fighteth for them against the Egyptians* (בְּמִצְרָיִם). This is the correct translation, as given by the English Version, so that in the Hebrew text both times מִצְרַיִם is used instead of מִצְרִיִּים, as very frequently; to take it the second time in its original meaning: "for the Lord has fought for them in Egypt," would not only be an incongruity, but also illogical in our context.—נלחם to fight, is, like ריב and many verbs implying a passion, as קנא , התאנף, construed with ב.

26. After all the Israelites had reached the opposite shore, God commanded Moses to stretch out his hand, when all the waves, which had hitherto stood like a wall, firm and immovable, at both sides of the traversing Israelites, would *return*

הַיָּם לִפְנוֹת בֹּקֶר לְאֵיתָנוֹ וּמִצְרַיִם נָסִים לִקְרָאתוֹ וַיְנַעֵר יְהוָה אֶת־מִצְרַיִם
בְּתוֹךְ הַיָּם׃ 28 וַיָּשֻׁבוּ הַמַּיִם וַיְכַסּוּ אֶת־הָרֶכֶב וְאֶת־הַפָּרָשִׁים לְכֹל חֵיל
פַּרְעֹה הַבָּאִים אַחֲרֵיהֶם בַּיָּם לֹא־נִשְׁאַר בָּהֶם עַד־אֶחָד׃ 29 וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

into their wonted bed, and devour the Egyptian chariots and their warriors in one common grave.

27. And Moses stretched out his hand, *and the sea returned towards the morning to its usual flood.* איתן from יתן with א prostheticum, originally *perennial*, constantly streaming; therefore here the usual flow of the sea (see *Schultens*, Origg. Hebr. i. 8, § 4); Targ. Onkelos, Jonathan, Ebn Ezra, and Rashi translate לתוקפו הראשון, "to its original strength or extent."—*And the Egyptians fled against it.* For when they saw that the floods were approaching, they turned round, and thus hastened towards the waters; but they were overtaken by the waves, before they could gain the Egyptian coast.—וינער *and He overthrew*, synonymous with רָמָה in xv. 1 (*Ebn Ezra*), properly, *to shake*, therefore the Sept. *ἐξετίναξε*.

28. And the waters returned and covered the chariots, and the horsemen, *together with* all the host of Pharaoh (לכל חיל פרעה). The preposition ל in לכל, has given rise to several conjectures. Rashi considers it here as superfluous, as in xxvii. 3, 19; Num. iii. 26; iv. 32; so that לכל would be the accusative: "the whole army of Pharaoh"; (an asyndeton, instead of *and* the whole, etc.); thus it is also explained by Nachmanides, and translated by the English Version (compare Is. xi. 9). But this use of ל is problematical; and the passages adduced admit of an easier interpretation. Mendelssohn translates: "*out of* the whole army of Pharaoh"; and in his commentary, he explains that the preposition ל connects the particular (the chariot-warriors) with the general (the whole army). This would virtually amount to a genitive in sense; and thus it is taken also by Ewald (Gr. § 515. 5), De Wette, Maurer, Zunz, Arnheim, and others. Against this explanation an objection could scarcely be raised, if we were permitted to suppose, that only the Egyptian *chariots* pursued the Israelites in the sea, whilst the infantry (ver. 9) remained behind; so that the former alone were devoured by the waves. It is true that both in this and in the following chapter, and in most other parts generally, the destruction of the chariots and its warriors is chiefly alluded to (ver. 26; xv. 4, 19, 21, etc); so that this particular stress would, perhaps, justify that conclusion. But it is evidently the intention of the sacred historian, to describe the total annihilation of the whole military force of the Egyptians, and he probably mentions the Egyptian war-chariots and horses with particular emphasis, only because these formed the chief pride and strength of the Egyptian army, and because these required a greater depth of the waves to drown them. We have, therefore, preferred to retain here the original signification of ל, as *together with;* and herewith coincides, in the meaning, the exposition of Gesenius (Lehrg. p. 681): "the chariots and horses *down to* the whole army" (compare 2 Sam. xvii. 22).—But still more decidedly must we reject the opinion of Wilkinson (Manners i. p. 54), that "there is no authority in the writings of Moses for supposing that *Pharaoh* was drowned in the Red Sea." There is the strongest possible authority for this supposition. The whole plan of pursuing the Israelites originated in Pharaoh (vers. 3, 5), who strongly blamed himself for his rash concessions; he took his own chariot and set out at the head of his whole army (vers. 6, 7), and followed the Hebrews; then God promised to glorify Himself "*through Pharaoh* and all his hosts" (ver. 17), which is emphatically repeated in ver. 18. They, the Egyptian army, led by Pharaoh,

the sea returned to [1]its usual flood towards the morning; and the Egyptians fled against it; and the Lord overthrew the Egyptians in the sea. 28. And the waters returned, and covered the chariots, and the horsemen, [2]together with all the host of Pharaoh that came into the sea after them; there remained not so much as one of them. 29. But the children of Israel [3]had walked upon dry *land* through the sea; and the waters *had been* a wall to them on their right hand, and

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—To his strength when the morning appeared. [2] *And.* [3] Walked.

follow the Israelites into the sea and are drowned; "there remained *not one of them.*" We believe this is too clear to be mistaken; and if Wilkinson maintains, that in the song of Moses no mention is made of the king's death, he has overlooked xv. 9, which clearly points back to xiv. 2: "The enemy said, I will pursue." This is evidently Pharaoh, and none else; and the same "enemy" who said this, was covered by the waves (xv. 10). Further, the authority of Psalm cxxxvi. 15, is more conclusive than Wilkinson believes, if considered from the Hebrew text, which says distinctly, "He (God) *drove* (ונער) *Pharaoh* and his host into the Red Sea" (the translation of the Authorised Version "overthrew" is certainly too indistinct; and the same verb is used in our text, ver. 27, נער, originally to *shake*, to throw down). In fact, the retaliation of divine justice would have been very imperfect, had it not included him who was the source and the author of the miseries of the Israelites, against whom the ten plagues were chiefly directed, and who had by his obstinacy plunged into endless calamities his unfortunate subjects, who were themselves less unwilling to obey the command of God (see x. 7). It may be true, that "whenever any fact is mentioned in the Bible history we do not discover anything on the monuments which tends to contradict it"; but it is most precarious to form Biblical conjectures on so uncertain a basis as hieroglyphical inscriptions; and Egyptian history is still too much disputed, even in its fundamental outlines and its very framework, to be used as an authority equal to that of the sacred text. Wilkinson's results must, in this respect, be viewed with the greater precaution, as he follows the questionable opinion of those, who count but 430 years from the immigration of Abraham into Canaan to the exodus of his descendants from Egypt, and places this latter event into the fourth year of the reign of Thotmes III. (see Introduction, §§ 1, 2).—About עד־אחד, see note on ix. 7.

29. *But the children of Israel had walked upon dry land through the sea*, etc. As the same sentence occurs already, almost with the same words, above in ver. 22, Rashbam proposes to take the verb הלכו as pluperfect: "But the children of Israel had walked," etc; an explanation equally favoured by grammar and the context. But this sentence is repeated, in order once more strongly to contrast the rescue of the Israelites with the destruction of the Egyptians. However, Ebn Ezra finds in those words, combined with xv. 8, 10, 19, the following sense: "When Pharaoh perished with his army in the returning floods, all the Israelites had not yet crossed the sea; a new wonder was necessary; and it happened, that at the same time a strong wind dried up that part of the Gulf where the Israelites were passing, whilst another wind from the opposite direction blew the waves, which had just been solid like a wall, upon Pharaoh and his army." It is scarcely necessary to mention, that this conjecture is no way borne out by the holy text.—The same commentator raises here also the question, how it was feasible, that more than two millions of people could cross the sea in

הָלְכוּ בַיַּבָּשָׁה בְּתוֹךְ הַיָּם וְהַמַּיִם לָהֶם חֹמָה מִימִינָם וּמִשְּׂמֹאלָם׃ 30 וַיּוֹשַׁע
יְהוָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִיַּד מִצְרָיִם וַיַּרְא יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־מִצְרַיִם
מֵת עַל־שְׂפַת הַיָּם׃ 31 וַיַּרְא יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־הַיָּד הַגְּדֹלָה אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה
יְהוָה בְּמִצְרַיִם וַיִּירְאוּ הָעָם אֶת־יְהוָה וַיַּאֲמִינוּ בַּיהוָה וּבְמֹשֶׁה
עַבְדּוֹ׃ פ

one night; and attempts a solution by the remark, that the hosts of the Israelites divided themselves into several sections, which effected the passage one at the side of the other along the Gulf; quoting a rabbinical remark (תוספות ערבין, 15 *a*), according to which the Israelites made the transit over the sea in a semicircular line, and met again in the desert of Shur on the eastern coast of the Gulf.

30. Now only were the Israelites completely and for ever rescued from the tyranny of the Egyptians, "and Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the sea-shore;" for the carcases of the Egyptians had been driven to the western shore. Ebn Ezra and Rashi explain: "The Israelites standing on the eastern coast saw the Egyptians die in the sea;" but it is much more natural to connect the words על־שפת הים with the adjoining word מת, than with the remoter וירא. Josephus (Antiq. II. xvi. 6) adds the following circumstance: "On the next day Moses gathered together the weapons of the Egyptians, which were brought to the camp of the Hebrews by the current of the sea, and the force of the winds assisting it; and he conjectured that this also happened by divine Providence, that they might not be destitute of weapons."

31. *And Israel saw the great might which the Lord had shown against the Egyptians.* יד, is, by Rashi, also explained with גבורה; and Targum Onkelos renders: ית גבורת ידא רבתא (so also Maurer, Herxheimer, and others).

CHAPTER XV.

Summary.—Hymn of praise of the Israelites after the successful passage over the Red Sea (ver. 1—21). They proceed farther, in a south-easterly direction, to Marah, where they break out into open murmuring on account of the bitterness of the water. Moses makes it, however, potable, by throwing into it, on the command of God, the wood of a certain tree. He avails himself of this miraculous event to exhort the people anew to obedience and submission to the divine guidance (ver. 22—26). From Marah they journey to Elim, where they encamp at the side of refreshing fountains, and under shady palm-trees (ver. 27).

THE HYMN OF MOSES.—Ver. 1—19.

Prefatory Remarks.

The following song, the interpretation of which we approach with a feeling of reverence and veneration, is as sublime and vigorous in its contents as it is masterly and perfect in its form; it has not only served as a model for all later hymns of victory in sacred lore, but it has scarcely been equalled by any production of a similar class in any other literature. But the richer the contents are, and the more finished the form, the nearer lies the temptation artificially to divide and subdivide the one, and violently to force the other into metrical laws, contrary to the simplicity of its structure. And great is the number of interpreters who have gone astray in either direction; they have indulged in logical niceties, and linguistic subtleties, which must necessarily destroy both the sublimity and the grace of this immortal lay. The inspired poet, powerfully moved by the mighty impulse of extraordinary events, surrounded by a people miraculously delivered from an all but certain ruin, and be-

on their left. 30. Thus the Lord saved Israel that day out of the hand of the Egyptians; and Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the sea-shore. 31. And Israel saw that great [1]might which the Lord [2]had shown against the Egyptians: and the people feared the Lord, and believed in the Lord, and in His servant Moses.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Work. [2] Did upon the Egyptians.

The other interpretations proposed, as, plague, infliction (מכה, *Ebn Ezra*), or work (English Version, *Rosenmüller*), express a similar sense.—*And the people feared the Lord, and believed in the Lord and in His servant Moses.* They feared God on account of His severe justice, which condemns, and His omnipotence, which chastises, every obstinacy; and they believed in Him, relying on His paternal care in the sterile, dreary desert, because He had hitherto so lovingly and so miraculously guided them; but they believed now in Moses also as the obvious messenger or servant of God, in whose name, and under whose direction he undertakes all his schemes. Only with this awful miracle, which destroyed the flower of the Egyptian youth, Israel's redemption was completed; the first and principal condition of their organization into an independent community was realized; Moses could now, without impediment, lead his nation to the place where it was to receive the divine revelation, and then, after such internal preparation, determine on the measures best calculated to advance his ulterior aim, the immigration into, and the conquest of, Canaan. But, before proceeding with any new plan, his pious mind feels that a holy debt is first to be paid, a debt of praise and gratitude to the Lord of Hosts, for the miraculous rescue, and His fatherly guidance; and Moses acquits himself of this duty in a manner worthy alike of his brilliant genius and of his deep and enthusiastic piety.

---

holding the corpses of the revengeful foes heaped up on the opposite coast, is carried away to a glowing effusion of gratitude, of rapture, and of hope, an effusion in which neither his mind heeds the fetters of pedantic logical connection, nor his imagination the restraints of prosodical rules: it is an ode of the highest lyrical flight, the result of the enthusiasm of the moment, the production of a lofty genius and an overflowing heart. Nobody will, in such a poem, expect a prosaical and regular disposition, a strictly systematical arrangement of ideas, or a rigid observance of the metrical precepts. But, notwithstanding all this, such composition is far from being confused in contents, or arbitrary in form; for that is just the mystery of heavenly inspiration, that it is the highest order in the midst of the greatest apparent arbitrariness, and that it creates laws whilst it seems to bid defiance to all laws. And thus we find the burden of our song clearly divided into two most characteristic parts, namely: 1st, in a *retrospect* upon the deliverance from the land of the Egyptians, and the punishment of the impious enemies (ver. 1—12); and, 2nd, a *prospective view* into the future, describing the terror of the warlike neighbouring nations, the Philistines, the Edomites, the Moabites, and lastly of the Canaanitish tribes, and penetrating, with a prophetic eye, forward to that glorious event which formed the noblest aim of the Egyptian redemption —the erection of the sanctuary on Moriah (ver. 13—18). In the Decalogue also we find those two elements: in the first commandment an allusion to Egyptian servitude; in the fourth, to the land of promise. Readers susceptible of great poetical impressions, may, from these wide outlines, imagine what scope for gigantic descriptions is opened in such theme: the omnipotence of the Lord, the vindictiveness of the enemies,

their ferocity and their destruction, praise and jubilation, gratitude and promises and hopes; and they will thank us that we do not, by anatomizing, annihilate the beautiful organism of the song—that we do not offend the obvious presence of the deity by profane declamation. But we must call attention to the wonderful instinct with which the poet, just at this moment, when the Israelitish nation happened to be between Egypt and Palestine, both as regards time and place, when they left the land of their ignominy with mixed feelings of joy and apprehension, and impatiently longed to reach the promised abodes of their future glory, that he, just then, described that double relation with so firm a hand and such characteristic traits. And thus has that, which many critics consider as a historical anticipation, carrying us into the times of David and Solomon, been ennobled into a poetical beauty by the sanctity of prophetic inspiration. And Herder remarks, in this respect: "If this poem contains parts which, it might seem, could not well have been sung in that period, it must be remembered, that the temple, the holy places, and the land, which the Israelites were destined to occupy, existed already clearly in God's and Moses' minds; and the latter prepared the people successfully for the exertions and sacrifices necessary for the realization of their hopes."

The same master-mind which manifests itself in the contents, is easily obvious in the form also. This ode has, with regard to the metre, shared the same fate with all the other poetical compositions of the Old Testament; some have discovered in it the artificial Greek measures, especially the Sapphic strophe (as *Huth*, *Clericus*, etc), others the iambic and anapestic rhythm, as Bellermann (Versuch über die Metrik der Hebräer, p. 159), who, in order to carry out his theory, arbitrarily divides our chapter into forty verses; and, where such operations are unavailable, the prosodists either propose self-invented metrical rules, at variance with every analogy, or they change the vowels of the sacred text, asserting that the correct pronunciation of Hebrew is totally lost to us (so *Lowth*, De Sacr. Poes. Hebr., Lect. iii.), or, lastly, where all this even is insufficient to support their aerial systems, they admit that the metre and the feet of the verses frequently vary according to the varying contents of the poem, and they thus destroy, with their own hands, the laboriously erected edifice of a metrical art, the first and chief law of which would necessarily be the uniformity and the regular recurrence of the same feet. Certainly, the efforts to trace the metre of our song are justifiable, since Josephus distinctly observes, that it is composed in hexameter verse (ἐν ἑξαμέτρῳ τόνῳ; Antiq. II. xvi. 4; compare IV. viii. 48; VII. xii. 3); and similar assertions we find in Philo (De Vit. Contempl. p. 901); Eusebius (Praep. Evang. xi. 3); Jerome (Praef. ad Chron.); and Isidorus Hispalensis (Orig. i. 38). But none of all these writers has so much as tried the attempt to prove their hypothesis in one single verse; and the conjecture of Löscher (De Caus. Ling. Hebr. xi. § 6), that those authors had, in that assertion, regarded the members or parts of the verses, rather than the measure of the syllables, is the more plausible, as it seems impossible, practically to apply any of those metres to our song, according to the laws of classical prosody. But, instead of this, we find here that free rhythmical grace, and that "parallelism of the members" which has, ever since the middle of the last century, been acknowledged as the only characteristic metre of Hebrew poetry, and which, indeed, forming a sort of rhyme of the *sense*, is capable of representing the lyrical inspiration of the soul with more vigour, originality and enthusiasm, than all artificial metres based merely on the uniformity of syllables. Whilst the poet seems merely intent upon expressing his idea with greater and greater lucidity, power and energy, assailing, in the impulse and fire of his effusions, the mind of the reader, from different sides with new images and new arguments, this very reiteration and renewal of attempts constitute a harmony of the form, the effects of which are the more overpowering, the more the modified form is adapted to the modified idea. Thus that parallelism of the members, if judiciously applied, produces the same beauty, and cer-

tainly implies the same power and grandeur as the complicated metres of the classics; and so far from imposing upon the poet the same burdensome fetters, it supports and facilitates the expression of the ideas, by those repetitions and additions peculiarly adapted for rounding and finishing the sentence. It is true, we are accustomed not only to expect a regular metre, in poetical composition, but even to consider it indispensable. But De Wette observes justly: "Everything depends on the character of the poem. Göthe has, just in the most sublime odes, disdained strict and regular metres, and contented himself with a certain free euphony (compare Prometheus, Meine Göttin, and other lyric poems). This formlessness has, indeed, a more elevated character than a certain prescribed form, and as sublimity is the character of the Hebrew poetry, the absence of regular metres cannot be found surprising" (Einleitung in die Psalmen, cap. vii.; see also *Mendelssohn's* preface to this song, *sub finem*). However this may be, the parallelism of the members seems to be a fundamental rhythmical law in all poetry; it forms the basis of the rhyme, of the strophe and antistrophe, the distich (hexameter and pentameter), the stanza, the ottaverime, and almost all modern metres.

The three principal kinds of parallelism occur in our poem also, namely: I. the *synonymous* parallelism (which consists of two or more members expressing *the same* idea with different words), in ver. 2 (second half), ver. 3 (see note), vers. 4, 6, 8 (where the same idea, concerning the great miracle of the drying up of the sea, is thrice repeated), vers. 11, 14 and 17—II. The *antithetical* parallelism (which consists in the *opposition* of the ideas), in ver. 16 (where the four members contain a double antithesis), ver. 19 (which certainly approaches already to prosaic diction, and does not perhaps strictly belong to the poem, see note); and, III, the *synthetic* parallelism (where a mere *co-ordination*, or a simple *progress* of the ideas, takes place), which is the most frequent in this song, and is the most lively form of parallelism, because it leads the sense onward: vers. 1, 2 (first half), 5, 7 (where the second member is, with peculiar emphasis, divided into two parts), 10, 12, 13, 15. Besides these, we find a remarkable instance of a merely rhythmical parallelism, which, without synonym, antithesis, or synthesis, only consists in a harmonious division of the parts, and describes the progressing action with particular emphasis; it is in ver. 9: "The enemy said, I will pursue; overtake; divide the spoil; my lust shall be satisfied upon them; I will draw my sword; my hand shall destroy them."—And the whole concludes with a brief and pithy ejaculation: "The Lord will reign for ever and ever" (ver. 18), forming a finished unity with the beginning: "I will sing to the Lord" (ver. 1).

From this short outline the reader, gifted with an imaginative mind, will derive already some notion of the power and variety displayed in this song, and will, we hope, be better prepared to appreciate its poetical beauties, than if, like some writers have done, we had indulged in empty exclamations on the elegance of every individual syllable, or word, or similar minutiæ.—But the assertion, that our poem compared with the blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix.) manifests a great progress and development, apparently originates in a want of logical distinctness. Both compositions are equally perfect in their kind; but the blessing of Jacob is a prophecy, and therefore necessarily abrupt, obscure, and brief; whilst our song is a lyric ode, and leaves therefore naturally more scope to imagination, and is more perspicuous and descriptive; the one has to depict the changeful fates of twelve tribes with a few emphatic words; the other has to delineate one single historical fact, poetical in itself, with all the means of artistic invention; both productions are, therefore, of heterogeneous, but not unequal merits; the difference lies only in their nature, not in the execution of the subjects treated; and as our song has become the model of the lyrical ode, so is that blessing the type of prophetic revelations.—But we add a remark of Herder, both a poetical and philosophical mind, about the grand economy of our poem: "The passage through the Red Sea has given occasion to the oldest and most harmonious triumphal

song, which we possess in the Hebrew language.....Its structure is simple, full of assonances and rhymes, which I am unable to render in our language, without violence to the words: for the Hebrew language is rich in such sounding assonances, on account of its uniform organism. Light, long, but few words echo away in the air, and mostly a deep monosyllabic sound finishes the verse" (Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie, ii. 3).

But we have to discuss one feature more, which materially contributes to the singular effect which this ode is calculated to produce. It would appear partly from the introduction: "Then sang *Moses and the children of Israel*," partly from vers. 21 and 22, in which it is related, that Miriam, the sister of Moses, went out with timbrels and dances, singing, "Praise the Lord, for He is exalted gloriously; the horse and its rider hath He thrown into the sea"; it would appear from these circumstances, with some probability, that our song was recited with the accompaniment of a chorus. How this was executed was already among the Rabbins a much disputed question. Some say, that the Israelites responded to Moses after every verse with the words, "I will sing to the Lord," etc. Others believe, that the Hebrews repeated every sentence, as Moses sang it before them. But Rabbi Nehemiah is of opinion, that Moses began with the words: "Then shall Israel sing" (אז ישיר ישראל), and the Israelites fell in: "I will sing to the Lord," etc. (אשירה ליי'); Moses then continued: "The Lord is my praise and song," etc. (עזי וזמרת יה וכו'); and the Israelites resumed: "He is my God, and I will glorify Him," etc. (זה אלי ואנוהו וכו'); and so on through the whole song.—According to Midrash Tanchuma, Moses recited alone the whole poem in the name of all Israel (כנגד כל ישראל).—But Philo (De Agricult. i., p. 312, ed Mangey) observes: "This song on the Red Sea was chaunted by all the men; not blindly and wildly, but with a clear consciousness, Moses singing every verse before them. The women recited it likewise under the direction of Miriam. And this hymn was sung by the two choruses; for it has an admirable *epodos* (refrain), extremely agreeable to repeat." Nor are these the only conjectures proposed on this subject; it avails little to enumerate them, as all are but personal suppositions, devoid of every Biblical foundation. In similar disputed cases, in which everything is to be derived from reflection and imagination, and nothing from the sacred text, the simplest interpretation, and that most suitable to the circumstances, is the most preferable. First, no statement of the text *compels* us to suppose a choral song. If it is stated, "that Moses and the children of Israel" sang this hymn, the one may be considered as its author, whilst the others learnt it by heart and sang it with him, according to the analogy of David's elegy on the death of Saul and Jonathan, which the poet ordered to teach the people (2 Sam. i. 18). And the recitation of the quoted words of Miriam, "with timbrels and with dances," points only to a combination, so common in antiquity, of poetry, music, and dance. But even if we suppose the application of choruses in the chaunting of this hymn, the remark in vers. 20 and 21, leads us with sufficient certainty to the conjecture, that if one recited the song, the chorus responded with the words: "Sing to the Lord, for He is gloriously exalted; the horse and its rider hath He thrown into the sea," like a kind of refrain, after appropriate points of rest or sections of the poem; perhaps after ver. 3 (the briefness and pith of which is itself well suitable for such refrain); after ver. 5 (where the description of the ruin of the Egyptians is finished); after ver. 10, (to where the anger of God is represented); after ver. 17 (to where God's mercy in guiding Israel into the Holy Land, the building of the temple, and the annihilation of all enemies is described, who might oppose them in this double purpose); and as a most appropriate conclusion serves the 18th verse: "The Lord will reign for ever and ever." It is remarkable, that each of these parts commences with a praise of God; so that the hymn, perfectly in harmony with the beginning words: "I will sing to the Lord," etc., seems to be intended as a song of praise to God, but most character-

istically coloured by the events of the moment; which is a new proof of its authenticity. Such a similar participation of the chorus in the recital of the triumphal hymn, is not only natural and easy, but in accordance with the usage of most ancient and modern nations; it is as impressive as it is unaffected; and could easily be performed even by a numerous people unskilled in the secrets of art (compare Ps. cxxxvi). Most of the other conjectures destroy the native vigour and originality of the song.—Thus the objection, that it was impossible to teach so quickly an uncultivated nation, as the Hebrews then were, so long and elaborate a poem, is of no weight, and might besides, be removed by considering that אז *then*, does not exactly signify the moment or even day of their arrival at the eastern coast of the Red Sea, but only *about that time*, between their passage and their departure to the wilderness of Shur. It has further been acknowledged, that this song is distinguished by a remarkable simplicity of ideas and expressions, that it contains very few of those bold elliptical constructions, which constitute one of the chief difficulties of Hebrew poetry, and that, however grand and sublime, it is so easy and clear, that even the multitude might comprehend and learn it (see *Glaire* on ver. 1). Further, the *length* of the poem has, in the minds of some critics, raised doubts as to its authenticity; since the *epenicia* of the Hebrews and other nations are usually but very brief ejaculations, as, for instance, that song of the women in 1 Sam. xviii. 7: "Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands." But on the one hand, the occasion for an enthusiastic song of praise was in our case by far more grand and sublime than at the first victories of David, and on the other hand, nothing prevents us from regarding that verse also as the mere refrain of some longer song, quite similar to our case, where the women repeat likewise, in very few impressive words, the burden and tendency of the ode.—But that Moses was able to compose so quickly, and almost *extempore*, so elaborate a song, will appear surprising to those only, who are not familiar with the astonishing facility with which Oriental poets exercise the art of improvisation, and who have not clearly represented to themselves the grand and overwhelming situation, in which this poem has been conceived, and which was of that extraordinary nature, which carries the mind beyond its natural capacities and inspires it with an enthusiasm not ordinarily belonging to it.

Tradition has for our ode, as for the last song of Moses (Deut. xxxii.), that of Deborah (Judg. v.), and David (2 Sam. xxii. and Ps. xviii.) fixed a certain form, in which they are to be written. All these poems (except Deut. xxxii.) are arranged in the following manner: The first line is written complete as usual. The second line consists of three parts; first *one* word, then after an empty space sufficient for nine letters, three, four, seldom five words; and after a similar interval again *one* word. The third line is composed of two parts; first three or four words; then after an empty space, such as described above, again three or four words. The whole poem is written in the same way, alternately like the second and third line, but so, that the writing of one line covers the empty space of the other, and *vice versa;* and that therefore three distinct columns are formed: as may be seen in our Hebrew text. This is called, אריח על נבי לבינה ולבינה על נבי אריח; אריח is half of a tile (לבינה); and this has three times the breadth of a hand (Bab. Bathr. iii. 6); that rule means, therefore, "half a line over the whole, and a whole line over half a line" (compare Megill. xvi. 2; *Maim.*, Hilch. Seph. Thor. viii.; Schulch. Aruch, Jor. De. 275.)

For further expositions concerning the rhythmical form of our song, we refer, among many other writers, to Carpzov (Intro. in V. T. ii.); Lowth (Prelect. de Sacr. Poes. Hebr.; Lect. xix.); Herder (Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie, i., p. 22, *et seq.*); Bellermann (Versuch über die Metrik der Herbräer, p. 159, *et seq.*); Le Clerc (Bibl. Univ. ix. 226, *et seq.*); De Wette (Introduction to his Commentary on the Psalms, § vii.); Ewald (Die Poëtischen Bücher des Alten Bundes, i. pp. 57—92); the works of Saalschütz and Meyer; and the Commentaries of Abarbanel and Mendelssohn.

טו 1 אָז יָשִׁיר־מֹשֶׁה וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־הַשִּׁירָה הַזֹּאת לַיהוָה וַיֹּאמְרוּ
לֵאמֹר אָשִׁירָה לַיהוָה כִּי־גָאֹה גָּאָה סוּס
וְרֹכְבוֹ רָמָה בַיָּם׃ 2 עָזִּי וְזִמְרָת יָהּ וַיְהִי־לִי
לִישׁוּעָה זֶה אֵלִי וְאַנְוֵהוּ אֱלֹהֵי

1. *Then sang Moses.* The particles אָז then, טרם and בטרם not yet, govern usually the future; for instance, אז יבנה שלמה במה "Then Solomon built a high place" (1 Kings xi. 7); see Deut. iv. 41; Josh. x. 12, etc. Ebn Ezra compares with this application of אָז the similar use of اذ in Arabic. In this case, אָז seems to be used like the Vav Conversivum Futuri in Praeteritum, with which it coincides in sense, and אז ישיר is synonymous with וישר; and so begins the song of Deborah (ותשר Judges v. 1). Untenable is the opinion of Rashi, who believes אז ישיר to be an elliptical construction instead of אמר לו לבו שישיר "his heart urged him to sing, and so he did, and spoke as follows: I will sing to the Lord," etc. Similarly he explains the other instances quoted.—About משה ובני ישראל see *supra*.—*This song*, it is called by Jewish writers שירה, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*; and on account of its sublimity, it is not only publicly recited in the synagogues on the seventh day of Passover, when the transit of the Israelites is believed to have taken place (see on xiv. 9), but it has been embodied in the daily prayers.—ליי׳ *to the Lord*, Targum Onkelos: קדם יי׳ before God; more correctly Mendelssohn, "in honor of God."—אשירה ליי׳, *I will sing to the Lord.* These words, to the end of the verse, express the aim and tendency of this poem as a song of praise to God for the deliverance of Israel and the destruction of the Egyptians; and are, therefore, pre-eminently adapted as a refrain for the chorus.—כי־גאה גאה, *for He is gloriously exalted.* גאה is an intransitive verb, *to be high* (Job viii. 11; Ezek. xlvii. 5), and therefore metaphorically, to be sublime, magnificent. The rendering of the Engl. Vers.: "He hath triumphed gloriously," is therefore less accurate. Similarly the Sept. ἐνδόξως γὰρ δεδόξασται, and Vulg. gloriose enim magnificatus est. Ebn Ezra paraphrases thus: "He has shown His grandeur; for both the horse, which is noble and strong, and the rider, who is a hero, have been thrown into the sea." The emphatical application of the infinitive before the verb finite, has given rise to the interpretation of Onkelos: "He showed Himself mighty over the mighty, and His is the might and the magnificence." Rashi explains that infinitive differently. However, it merely adds intensity to the idea, without in the least altering it.—סוס ורכבו וכ׳, *The horse and its rider hath He thrown into the sea.* The vowels of רֹכְבוֹ compel us to translate it as a participle Kal of רכב, rider, horseman, synonymous with פרש, which is used in its stead in the preceding chapter. And poetically *rider* may be applied for a *warrior on a battle-chariot.* Thus, as rider, has רֹכֵב been taken almost by all ancient translators (Sept. ἀναβάτην, Vulg. accensorem, Rashi, etc.; further, the English Version, Mendelssohn, Salomon, Herxheimer, Zunz, Arnheim, and others). . All the others (as Luther, Herder, De Wette), take it for *chariot*, which would, however, require the vowels רִכְבּוֹ as in xiv. 17, 18, 26; and we see no reason to abandon here the usual meaning, as "horse and *rider*," is here much more appropriate than "horse and *chariot*"; for the destruction of the Egyptian horsemen or warriors is chiefly urged.—This verse is both in its individual members, and in its structure as a whole, an excellent, most powerful, and suitable introduction to the following descriptions: and betrays the master at the very commencement.

2. This sentence consists of two

CHAP. XV. 1. Then sang Moses and the children of Israel this song to the Lord, and spoke, saying: I will sing to the Lord, for [1] He is gloriously exalted: the horse and its rider hath He thrown into the sea. 2. The Lord *is* my [2] praise and song, [3] for He hath become my salvation; He *is* my God, and I will [4] glorify Him; my father's God,

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—He hath triumphed gloriously. [2] Strength. [3] And. [4] Prepare him an habitation.

halves, one of which occurs as a whole verse in Isa. xii. 2, and Ps. cxviii. 14.—*The Lord is my praise and my song.* עָז, originally *might, power*, then *splendour, majesty* (as in Ps. xcvi. 6, עז ותפארת), and, with a natural transition, *glory, praise*, which signification it has, undoubtedly, in 2 Chron. xxx. 21 (כלי־עז, instruments of praise), and which is well adapted here, because זמרה, *song*, is coupled with it as a synonym; it points clearly back to the principal idea, אשירה ליי׳, and introduces, aptly, together with the following words, the pithy and fiery ejaculation of the next verse: "The Lord is a man of war: the Eternal is His name." Compare also Ps. viii. 3 (where the Septuagint renders *αἶνον*, although it translates here *βοηθός μοι*, my help); xxix. 1; 1 Chron. xvi. 27. The form זמרת, song, instead of זמרה, is analogous with עזרת, help (Ps. lx. 13; cviii. 13, instead of עזרה); שנת, sleep (Ps. cxxxii. 4, instead of שנה); נחלת (Ps. xvi. 6, instead of נחלה). All these words are poetical, and the corresponding forms in ה are used in prose. But מחרת, *the following day*, has no equivalent ending in ה, and is applied both in prose and poetry. In זמרת, the suffix of the first person singular is to be supplied from the preceding substantive עזי. The cases are not unfrequent, when pronouns, which can easily be supplied, are omitted, as, on the other hand, suffixes are sometimes used pleonastically. We have already noticed several instances where the *accusative* of the pronoun was omitted, as ii. 3, ותשם בסוף, "and she laid *it* in the flags;" ii. 25, וידע אלהים, "and God regarded *them*." We may here suppose a similar ellipsis of the suffix, and there is no reason to read, with some manuscripts, זמרתי, or to assume that the suffix י has been omitted on account of the following י in יה; nor can the unanimity of the ancient translators, who all render *my song*, be adduced in support of the reading זמרתי; for זמרת also, in our connection, cannot possibly be translated otherwise. Similar constructions occur in Gen. vi. 19; Ps. xii. 9; xl. 10. Rashi, who finds the vowels of עָזִּי, instead of עֻזִּי, remarkable, thus explains these words, that עזי and זמרת are in the status constructus, namely, עזי after the analogy of שכני סנה, literally, "the inhabitant of the bush" (Deut. xxxiii.16), הפכי הצור, "He who changes the rock" (Ps. cxiv. 8), etc. (compare ver. 6), and he takes the sentence thus: "the might and the vengeance (וזמרת) of God, they were (ויהי) to me a salvation;" for the cases are not rare that the subject is emphatically followed by the verb, with the Vav Conversivum (as in ix. 21: ואשר לא־שם לבו על־דבר יי׳ ויעזב). But 1st. זמרה in the significa- of *vengeance*, is uncertain; and 2nd, the status constructus of זמרה would be זִמְרַת, not זִמְרָת.—Rashbam adopts, on the whole, Rashi's opinion, whilst Ebn Ezra proposes the forced interpretation: "God is my might, and the song of my might," so that עזי must be repeated after וזמרת.—יָהּ, is a poetical abbreviated form of יהוה, the correct vocalization of which is, according to our note on iii. 14, יַהְוֶה, from which is formed, by way of apocope, יַהוּ, as יִשְׁתַּחוּ from יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה; and as the syllable וּ in יַהוּ is toneless, it is abbreviated into יָהּ, and both forms are used

אָבִי וַאֲרֹמְמֶנְהוּ׃ 3 יְהוָה אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה יְהוָה
שְׁמוֹ׃ 4 מַרְכְּבֹת פַּרְעֹה וְחֵילוֹ יָרָה בַיָּם וּמִבְחַר
שָׁלִשָׁיו טֻבְּעוּ בְיַם־סוּף׃ 5 תְּהֹמֹת יְכַסְיֻמוּ יָרְדוּ בִמְצוֹלֹת כְּמוֹ־
אָבֶן׃ 6 יְמִינְךָ יְהוָה נֶאְדָּרִי בַּכֹּחַ יְמִינְךָ

promiscuously at the end of many proper nouns, as אליהו and אליה; ירמיהו and ירמיה, etc. About the combinations יה יהוה, (Ps. cxviii. 14, and Isa. xii. 2); and יה אלהים (Ps. lxviii. 19), see *Gesen.* Thes. p. 580, *b.* We need scarcely remark, that the opinion of Rosenmüller on Isa. xii. 2, that יה is to be traced to the Egyptian ΙΑΩ, is erroneous. The Septuagint renders the first part of our verse thus: Βοηθὸς καὶ σκεπαστὴς ἐγένετό μοι εἰς σωτηρίαν, in which translation the word יה is entirely omitted.—ויהי־לי לישועה, *for He hath become my salvation.* The logical connection with the preceding words: "God is my praise and song," demands the translation of the ו, in ויהי, by *for*, as the first half of this verse is quite analogous with the contents of the preceding one (vide *supra*), where the second part is introduced with כי.—*He is my God, and I will glorify Him* (ואנוהו), *my father's God and I will exalt Him* (וארממנהו). Both the connection with the preceding verse, and the parallelism with וארממנהו, show that אנוהו is to be derived here from נוה, in the signification of נאה (from which נאוה), to be beautiful, and not from נוה to dwell (from which נָוֶה); so that the Hiphil אנוהו, means: "I will make beautiful; I will glorify," as the Septuagint renders; καὶ δοξάσω αὐτόν; the Vulgate: "et glorificabo eum"; Rashi: "I will relate His glory and His praise to future generations"; Luther: "Ich will ihn preisen"; and most of the modern interpreters. Incorrect is, therefore, the rendering of the English Version, which has followed the opinion of those who translate, like Onkelos: "I shall build thee a sanctuary," or explain, like Ebn Ezra: "I shall establish Him in a resting-place," and which renders: "and I will prepare him an habitation."—אלהי אבי stands instead of אלהי אבתי, as אלהי אביך, in iii. 6, instead of אלהי אבתיך. The sense is: The God who has shown Himself merciful and gracious to my forefathers, has now glorified Himself through me also; thus the God of tradition has become a God of my own experience, the God of *belief*, a God of *knowledge*.

3. *The Lord is a man of war.* God has annihilated the powerful enemies, who approached with a formidable might; and thus He has shown Himself as a God of war and battles. איש is used paraphrastically, because there is in Hebrew no adjective of מִלְחָמָה (see note on iv. 10), and the sense is simply: God is *warlike*. It is thus but a slight modification, if Onkelos translates: "God is the victorious Lord of battles," and Rashi and Ebn Ezra explain בעל מלחמה (so בעל החלמות in Gen. xxxvii. 19).—The Samaritan Codex reads גבור במלחמה, a hero in war, and the Sept. renders συντρίβων πολέμους crushing (subduing) wars, which two last-mentioned versions may, according to Rosenmüller, partly have been dictated by the fear lest Non-Israelitish readers believe that the Hebrews worshipped a God who delights in warfare; but איש מלחמה does not even imply the notion of *brave* warrior, as in many passages גבור חיל is added by way of qualification (1 Sam. xvi. 18; Is. iii. 2, etc.) The short sentence concludes with the very significant words, יהוה שמו, *the Eternal is His name.* It is obvious, that יהוה is here used with regard to iii. 15, and vi. 3, where this holy name of the "Eternal and unchangeable God" was, in its full and deep meaning, first revealed to Moses and the people of Israel, with the promise that He would

and I will exalt Him. 3. The Lord *is* a man of war: the Eternal *is* His name.—4. Pharaoh's chariots and his host hath He cast into the sea: [1]his choicest warriors are drowned in the Red Sea. 5. The depths have covered them: they sank into the bottom as a stone. 6. Thy right hand, O Lord, [2]glorified in power, thy right hand,

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—His chosen captains. [2] Is become glorious.

lead them miraculously from the Egyptian thraldom, after fearful chastisement of their adversaries. Now, when this promise has been so gloriously realized, His whole unfathomed might and grandeur are comprised in the attributes of His nature, which is expressed and manifested by His very name. Thus is יהוה here to be taken, as in vi. 3, as an appellative noun: "*The Eternal*," not as a proper noun *God* or *the Lord* (compare Amos v. 8, and ix. 6).—After this short emphatical verse, which condenses all the preceding ideas in one shout of jubilation, the introduction of our poem is finished, and it proceeds now to the description of the overthrow of the enemies (vers. 4—8).

4. ירה (= רמה in ver. 1) is here applied in its primary signification, *to throw*, especially to throw arrows (1 Sam. xx. 36, 37, etc.), wherefore Ebn Ezra, perhaps too artificially, concludes, that the chariots and warriors of Pharaoh were immersed in the depth with the velocity of arrows. The other meanings of ירה, to lay foundations, to sprinkle or water, and in Hiphil, to teach, are derivative significations.—מבחר *choice*, abstract noun, always used in the status constructus, and therefore מבחר שלשיו his choicest warriors (properly, the flower of his warriors). About שלשים, see note to xiv. 7.—טֻבְּעוּ Pual of טבע; Kal and Pual have the same signification, *to sink*, to be plunged. Compare Lam. ii. 9; Ps. ix. 16. In the phrase מבחר שלשיו טבעו, the plural of the verb is applied according to the peculiar usage of the Hebrew syntax, that after compound substantives the verb agrees frequently with the genitive instead of corresponding with the nomen regens, for instance, קול דמי אחיך צועקים, "the voice of the blood of thy brother cries," Gen. iv. 10; and this construction is invariably applied after the substantive כל, "entirety, totality"; as in ver. 20. ותצאן כל הנשים "and all the women went out." Compare Gen. viii. 10.

5. *The depths have covered them.* תהום (from הום, to make a noise, used of waves in tumult), *wave* or abyss. The form יְכַסְיֻמוּ (Piel of כסה, to cover, with the suffix of the third person plural) is irregular in several respects: 1. יְכַסְיוּ stands instead of יְכַסּוּ; the original י, which is contained in the verbs ל״ה, being preserved, as in תְּדַמְּיוּנִי, Isaiah xl. 25; יִרְבְּיֻן, Deut. viii. 13; יִרְוְיֻן, Ps. xxxvi. 9. 2. That the ס is not provided with the characteristic dagesh forte of the Piel cannot appear surprising, as it is frequently omitted in letters, which form the end of syllables, and which have, therefore, a Scheva. 3. The suffix ֻמוּ, instead of מוֹ (vers. 7, 9, 10), is the usual form in the Ethiopian dialect, and might here, as Rashi observes, be used for the sake of uniformity with the preceding Shureck (וּ); compare יְשְׁפּוּטוּ instead of יִשְׁפְּטוּ, xviii. 26. The Sept. translates: πόντῳ ἐκάλυψεν αὐτούς, "He hid them in the sea," from which Vater concludes, without reason, that the verb must be written יְכַסֵּימוֹ, "He covered them."—מְצוּלָה and מְצוּלָה (=צולה, from צול=צלל, to be sunk), depth of the sea, abyss.—*They sank into the bottom as a stone*, or ver. 10, *as lead*, because both sink into the water *quickly*, and without a chance of coming up again.

6. *Thy right hand, O Lord, glorified in power.* נֶאְדָּרִי, participle Niphal, with י paragogicum (see on ver. 2 ad עָזִּי;

יְהוָה תִּרְעַץ אוֹיֵב׃ 7 וּבְרֹב גְּאוֹנְךָ תַּהֲרֹס
קָמֶיךָ תְּשַׁלַּח חֲרֹנְךָ יֹאכְלֵמוֹ כַּקַּשׁ׃ 8 וּבְרוּחַ
אַפֶּיךָ נֶעֶרְמוּ מַיִם נִצְּבוּ כְמוֹ־נֵד
נֹזְלִים קָפְאוּ תְהֹמֹת בְּלֶב־יָם׃ 9 אָמַר
אוֹיֵב אֶרְדֹּף אַשִּׂיג אֲחַלֵּק שָׁלָל תִּמְלָאֵמוֹ

=מנביעי, משפילי) from אדר, kindred with הדר, to adorn, to honor; therefore to render illustrious. It matters little, whether we refer נאדרי as apposition to ימינך, or to יי׳; for ימין is in the meaning of *right hand*, also joined with the masculine (see Prov. xxvii. 16); but we do not take it as a verb finite, by which the sentence would lose much of its emphasis.—The verses 6 and 7, may be considered as a general description of God's omnipotence and justice, to which the poet feels himself urgently invited by the remembrance of the late glorious events; so that only in ver. 8, the application on the present case, the destruction of the *Egyptians*, would follow; therefore the future תרעץ, תהרס and תשלח, may aptly be translated as present tenses: "Thy right hand, O Lord, dashes the enemy," etc., by which those exclamations evidently gain in intensity; for they cease to be single facts of a transitory experience; but they become general and permanent truths. The anthropomorphistic expressions: "the right hand of God," "man of war," etc.; will not give offence to those, who can feel purely and poetically. If God is at all to be praised by human language, scarcely a more powerful, majestic, and dignified form can be imagined, than that of this incomparable song.—About the repetition of the subject, see Ps. xcii. 10; xciii. 3; see also vers. 11, 16, etc.

7. *And in the greatness of Thy excellency Thou overthrowest those who rise up against Thee*, that is, Thy adversaries, those who oppose themselves to Thy will, here referring to the Egyptians. Compare xxxii. 25; Deut. xxxiii. 11. Onkelos, Jonathan, Rashi, and others, explain less plausibly, "Thou overthrowest those who rise up against *Thy people* Israel;" after the analogy of Ps. lxxxiii. 3, 4.—The participle (קמים) is used as substantive; see *Ewald*, Gram. p. 620; see also *Gesenius*, Gram. § 132 (who believes קמיך to be applied instead of קמים עליך).—The wrath of God consumes the enemies with the same facility and rapidity with which fire devours the stubble of the field (see note on xxii. 5). Compare Is. v. 24; xvii. 14.

8. After the poet has, in the three preceding verses, dilated upon the power of God, with which He punishes and destroys the wicked, he now describes His mercy towards those who have committed themselves to His protection; and how unlimited this love is, he proves from the astounding miracle of the division of the sea, which, giving up its nature, formed, with its waves, a firm wall, and, instead of streaming like a fluid, congealed into a hard substance. The words וברוח אפיך, cannot therefore mean: "and by the breath of Thy anger" (*Septuagint*, *Rashi*, and others), for not an act of divine wrath, but of divine mercy, was the miracle of the separation of the sea. This does not exclude the admission that רוח אף has really, in other passages, the meaning of "breath of anger," as Job iv. 9, according to the old and far-spread belief that the nose is the seat of anger (compare *Theocr.* i. 18: χολὴ ποτὶ ῥινὶ κάθηται, "the anger sits in the nose"), or that the anger manifests itself the most visibly in that part of the face. But here this expression stands evidently with reference to xiv. 21, where the dryness of the sea is effected by a strong east-wind which God had sent (see ver. 10); and in the same grand imagery

O Lord, [1]dashes in pieces the enemy. 7. And in the greatness of Thy [2]sublimity Thou [3]overthrowest those who [4]rise up against thee: Thou [5]sendest forth Thy wrath; it consumes them as stubble. 8. And with the blast of Thy nostrils the waters were [6]piled up, the floods stood upright like a [7]mound, *and* the depths congealed in the heart of the sea.—9. The enemy said, I will pursue; overtake; divide the spoil; my lust be satisfied upon

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Hath dashed. [2] Excellency. [3] Hast overthrown. [4] Rose. [5] Sentest. [6] Gathered together. [7] Heap.

which speaks of a "right hand of God" (see note on ver 6), the strong wind is here described as the all-powerful breath of God; see Ps. xviii. 16. Onkelos, evidently anxious to avoid these human epithets, translates freely: ובמימר פומך "with the word of Thy mouth."—נערמו מים. No doubt can exist on the signification of the verb ערם, if it is compared with the frequently occurring derivative עֲרֵמָה, which means, indisputably, *heap*. The root ערם, which may be akin with רום, Chaldaic רעם, to be high, has, in the other Semitic dialects, also the similar signification of *piling up, heaping up*, (compare *Gesenius*, Thes. p. 1071), see Cant. vii. 2; Nehem. iii. 34, etc. Quite untenable, is, therefore, the translation of Onkelos, who renders חכימא מיא, "the waters have acted wisely," connecting it with ערם, to bè wise, cunning (Gen. iii. 1). The translation of the Septuagint (διέστη τὸ ὕδωρ, "the water separated"), is inaccurate.—*The floods stood upright like a mound* (כמו נד). About the meaning and the metaphor implied in נֵד, see note on xiv. 21, 22, p. 251. It is unmistakable, that נד is synonymous with חומה, which occurs in that passage, and the Septuagint translates correctly, ὡσεὶ τεῖχος; and Onkelos, כשור; and thus only we have a clear and beautiful antithesis: the *floods* (נזלים from נזל, to flow, to run), stood like a *wall*. The meaning *heap*, as the English Version here renders, and Rosenmüller explains in Ps. xxxiii. 7, would destroy this opposition, nor would it be, in itself, a very poetical image. The rendering of the Syriac Version, איך דבוקא, as in casks, is obviously based on the reading כנאוד, instead of נֵד, which is in Ps. xxxiii. 7 expressed by almost all ancient translators.—*The depths congealed in the heart of the sea.* The signification of the rarely used verb קפא, is evident from Job x. 10, according to which passage it means, to coagulate, to curdle; therefore, in our verse, the waters congealed, they became hard, which agrees well with נד, in the signification of wall. The Sept. translates, therefore, correctly, ἐπάγη; and Ebn Ezra explains נקרשו "they congealed;" and Rashi, still more distinctly: "the floods became hard, and assumed the properties of stones." בלב־ים, poetically for בתוך הים, in xiv. 22: not exactly in the *midst* of the sea, but only within it (see note on xiv. 15—18. p. 249). Therefore the explanations of Ebn Ezra: "the midst of a thing is called the heart of it, because the heart is in the midst of the body;" and of Rashi, "the heart signifies the chief and strongest part of a thing," are too literal and narrow.

9. One of the most beautiful descriptions is, perhaps, contained in this verse, which delineates, with as much poetical grace as characteristic vigour, the fury, the vindictiveness, and the sanguinary vehemence of the foes. The brief but pithy sentences, introduced without connection or conjunction, are heaped in irregular abundance, to represent the insatiable desire of the adversaries: "The enemy said, I will pursue; overtake; divide the spoil; my lust be satisfied upon them" (תמלאמו נפשי). That the verbs signify-

נַפְשִׁי אָרִיק חַרְבִּי תּוֹרִישֵׁמוֹ יָדִי׃ 10 נָשַׁפְתָּ
בְרוּחֲךָ כִּסָּמוֹ יָם צָלְלוּ כַּעוֹפֶרֶת בְּמַיִם
אַדִּירִים׃ 11 מִי־כָמֹכָה בָּאֵלִם יְהוָה מִי
כָּמֹכָה נֶאְדָּר בַּקֹּדֶשׁ נוֹרָא תְהִלֹּת עֹשֵׂה

ing fulness are construed with the accusative, has already been observed on i. 7, to which we refer; תמלאמו is, therefore, poetically used instead of תמלא אתם (see on ver. 5, ad תכסימו).—נפשי signifies here, as in Gen. xxiii. 8; Deut. xii. 20, etc., desire, lust. The translation of the Septuagint: ἐμπλήσω ψυχήν μου is, therefore, inaccurate; better the Vulgate: implebitur anima mea.—אריק חרבי is, as Onkelos correctly translates, אשלוף חרבי, "I will draw my sword," which signification is easily reducible to the usual meaning of ריק, *to empty*. Compare Rashi's remarks on these words.—The Septuagint has again inaccurately: ἀνελῶ τῇ μαχαίρᾳ μου, "I shall destroy by my sword," which sense is expressed by the *following* verb: תורישמו ידי, *my hand shall destroy them*. יָרַשׁ, originally to possess or inherit, from which the signification of *destroying*, *blotting out*, is derived, as in Num. xiv. 12; xxxiii. 55; or as Vater remarks: "הוריש, refers both to him, who obtains a possession, and to him who loses it; in the former sense, it means to occupy, to subdue; in the latter, to expel, to destroy." And thus translates Onkelos: תשיצינון ידי, "my hand will extirpate them," and the Vulgate: "interficiet eos"; Ebn Ezra, תשמידם. Rashi connects it with מוריש, in the meaning "to make poor" (1 Sam. ii. 7), which is here, however, too artificial. The Septuagint preserves the more primary signification of the verb: κυριεύσει ἡ χείρ μου, "my hand shall govern"; but weakens hereby the sense, as is also the case at the beginning of the verse, where it contracts the two verbs ארדף אשיג into the words Διώξας καταλήψομαι.—According to some interpreters (as Rashbam and others) Pharaoh uttered this self-exhortation, when he saw, that the sea had divided itself before the Israelites, and when he was seized by the natural desire to avail himself of this miracle for himself and his army also, and thus to conquer the Israelites already in the sea. With this opinion, the contents of the following verse do not disagree: "But Thou didst blow with Thy wind, the sea covered them." However, in a high lyrical enthusiasm, the poet returns once more to the beginning, describing with a few, but rapid and vigorous traits, the operations of the enemies, from the moment, when the idea of pursuing the Israelites arose in their minds, a desire which was to end with the fearful overthrow of their power. Thus we see in *one* significant moment the sanguinary Egyptians return to their obduracy, equip themselves for war, depart, pursue, and perish in the sea. Where with so simple means has so powerful a rhetorical effect been ever produced?

10. *Thou didst blow with Thy wind.* נשף kindred with נפש and נשם, *to blow* (compare Isaiah xl. 24). The Septuagint freely: ἀπέστειλας τὸ πνεῦμά σου, "Thou didst send forth Thy wind."—רוח is here, as in ver. 8, the *wind*; but there it is the gale which represses the waters and creates a dry path; whilst it is here the wind which makes the floods return, brings them back into their usual bed—and *covers the enemies*.—*They sank like lead in the mighty waters.* צלל, which occurs in other passages also in the significations of *sounding* (tinnivit) and of *being shaded*, is here evidently used in the sense of *precipitating*, *rolling*, wherefore Gesenius (Thes. p. 1169) believes it to be akin with גלל (compare p. 1144, A.): "deorsum voluti sunt"; and thus Zunz: "sie rollten." The Septuagint translates, ἔδυσαν (comp. *Hom.* Il. xviii. 140, δῦναι κόλπον θαλάσ-

them; I will draw my sword; my hand shall destroy them:—10. Thou didst blow with Thy wind, the sea covered them; they sank like lead in the mighty waters. 11. Who *is* like Thee, O Lord, among the gods? Who *is* like Thee, glorious in holiness, awful *in* praises,

σης); Vulgate, "submersi sunt"; Onkelos, אשתקעו; so also the Syriac Version and Saadiah.—The form צָלֲלוּ (with Chateph-Patach beneath the first ל), like גָלֲלוּ, in Gen. xxix. 3, 8, stands instead of צָלְלוּ, after the analogy of סָבּוּ; compare לֻקֳחָה instead of לֻקְחָה, Gen. ii. 23, etc.—*Like lead*, compare ver. 5, "as a stone." The heavy lead certainly sinks with greater velocity in the water, the calmer and the less deep it is, so that Rashbam explains not without some appearance: "they sank into the water, *although* it was mighty"; but the adjective אדירים, mighty, is here merely an epitheton ornans, joined with מים, without having any reference to צללו.—About the connection see on ver. 9.

11. Deeply moved by the remembrance of the chastisement of the haughty enemies, whose destruction the poet had once more represented to his mind with the most lively colours, he breaks out into an enthusiastic praise of God, whom no being of the whole universe can ever equal in grandeur, in holiness, in exalted glory and miraculous power.—Difficult is here the explanation of אלם in the words מי־כמכה באלם יי׳. The old commentators differ widely in this respect. Targum Onkelos evades the difficulty; Targum Jonathan expresses the word by באילי מרומא; and so the Samaritan Codex, Ebn Ezra, Nachmanides: מלאכי מעלי; Rashi, בחזקים, "among the strong, powerful"; and the Vulgate, "in fortibus"; and similarly among the modern translators: Mendelssohn, Zunz, and others. But the analogy of other passages teaches us clearly, that אלים, or אילים, signifies *gods*, thus God himself is in Dan. xi. 36, called אל אלים "God of gods," that is, the highest God, which is synonymous with אלהי אלהים, Ps. cxxxvi. 2.—That the singular אֵל, which is, perhaps, the oldest biliteral primitive root of all similar names of the deity, is, in *poetry*, used in the signification of God, is known from innumerable passages (Job v. 8; viii. 5, 13, 20, etc.). This word has often been connected with אל in the meaning of *might*, so that by way of metonomy *the mighty* stands instead of *might*; and אֵל is κατ' ἐξοχήν, *the true God*. If we renounce the supposition, that אֵל is a primitive root, that explanation would have much plausibility (compare Rosenmüller on Ps. xxix. 1). But undoubtedly objectionable is the opinion, that אֵל is connected with אָלָה, to swear, so that it would signify θεὸς ὅρκιος; nor is the conjecture of J. D. Michaelis more acceptable that it is akin with the Arabic الو "beneficence," so that it means the *good* (German: *Gott*). In *prose* it is always combined with an adjective or another substantive, as אל דעות , אל שדי , אל עליון (1 Sam. ii. 3), האל אלהי אביך (Gen. xlvi. 3), etc.—It is a general name for deities, and is therefore frequently applied with regard to idols, as is evident from many undisputed passages (for instance, Is. xliv. 10, 15; xlv. 20; xlvi. 6, etc.), and as the phrases אל אחר, *another god*, אל זר *a strange god* (Ps. lxxxi. 10), etc., prove. Now, the Egyptians had naturally under the auspices of their gods, that is, of those beings, whom *they* considered to be *mighty gods*, marched against the Israelites. Therefore, together with the Egyptians their gods also had been conquered; and most appropriate is, therefore, the exclamation: "Who is like Thee, O Lord, among the gods"? Whether the idols of the heathens are indeed gods, is here indifferent; *they* call them so, and therefore those who mention them are compelled

פֶלֶא׃ 12 נָטִיתָ יְמִינְךָ תִּבְלָעֵמוֹ אָרֶץ׃ 13 נָחִיתָ
בְחַסְדְּךָ עַם־זוּ גָּאָלְתָּ נֵהַלְתָּ בְעָזְּךָ אֶל־נְוֵה
קָדְשֶׁךָ׃ 14 שָׁמְעוּ עַמִּים יִרְגָּזוּן חִיל
אָחַז יֹשְׁבֵי פְּלָשֶׁת׃ 15 אָז נִבְהֲלוּ אַלּוּפֵי

to designate them with that name, although such idol is in reality לא־אל "a not-god," who is god in name, not in reality (Deut. xxxii. 21; comp. note on vi. 7). And thus translates the Septuagint ἐν θεοῖς, and by far the greater part of the modern interpreters (as Luther, English Version, Herder, Vater, Rosenmüller, De Wette, and others). Compare also xviii. 11; and Ps. lxxxvi. 8; where אלהים is used instead of אלים, namely, אין כמוך באלהים ארני.—*Who is like Thee glorious in holiness* (נאדר בקדש). This is manifestly the correct translation of בקדש. The Septuagint translates ἐν ἁγίοις in the sanctuary, which has been adopted also by Vater and others. But this is entirely against the context; for only in vers. 13 and 17, the distant hope, to glorify God in His temple, is alluded to.—God has anew manifested His holiness by miraculously protecting the righteous and annihilating the wicked.—נורא תהלת *awful in praises.* Jewish interpreters understand this so, that the pious man ought to be afraid to praise God, since he will ever be unable to exhaust all His glorious attributes (see Rashi and Ebn Ezra). But the substantive יראה signifies not only fear, but also reverence; and therefore נורא תהלת means, revered in praise; the qualities which are mentioned in praising Him, fill the mind with awe and reverence.—Luther changes the substantives of our verse also into adjectives, and translates: "Wer ist dir gleich, der so mächtig, heilig, schrecklich, löblich und wunderthätig ist." But this monotonous enumeration of adjectives is a very inadequate substitute for the intensity and power of the Hebrew verse, which is divided into four symmetrical parts, bringing rest into the impetuosity of the ideas. The Vulgate also translates נורא תהלת, "terribilis atque laudabilis." Glaire takes תְּהִלֹּת here with little plausibility in its etymological signification, *splendour*, from הלל, *to shine*, and translates: "terrible par l'eclat de la majesté qui l'environne."

12. *Thou stretchedst out Thy right hand: the earth swallowed them.* Geddes believes that these words would more suitably stand after the tenth verse than here, which remark seems to have the greater probability, as, with verse 11, the first chief part of the poem, the retrospect into the past, is finished. However, 1st, These words explain the conclusion of the 11th verse, עשה־פלא, doing wonders, 2nd, they comprise, once more, the leading idea of the first part, in a few concise words; and, 3rd, they form an appropriate transition to the following verses: God destroyed the Egyptians by a wonder in the sea; but He leads the Israelites lovingly on into the land of promise. So this verse forms, most internally, the connection between the two principal parts of the song, pointing as it does, in one respect, to the first, in another, to the latter part. *Thou stretchedst out*, etc. see xiv. 26. *The earth swallowed them*, that is, the deep abyss of the sea, which covers the earth.

13. The verbs of this and the following verse (נחית-, נהלת, etc.), are, according to the sense, futures, but may, with poetical vivacity, be translated as presents, till, in verse 15, the text itself passes over into the future forms (תבאמו , תפל, etc.), which was even the case already in ver. 14, ירגזון. Those who date the origin of this song in the times of David or Solomon, translate those verbs here naturally as preterites: "thou hast led," etc. as also the English Version, although its authors certainly did not question the authenticity of the

doing wonders? 12. Thou stretchedst out Thy right hand: the earth swallowed them.

13. Thou in Thy mercy [1]leadest forth the people which Thou hast redeemed; Thou [2]guidest *them* in Thy strength to Thy holy habitation. 14. The [3]nations will hear *it*, *and* will be afraid; [4]terror will seize the inhabitants of [5]Philistia. 15. Then the chiefs of Edom will be amazed;

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Hast led. [2] Hast guided. [3] People. [4] Sorrow. [5] Palestina.

poem (see *supra*, p. 260). The following part describes, in prophetic images, the providence of God for the Israelites, shielding them till they have overcome the dangers of the desert, conquered the nations of Canaan, and erected the sanctuary on Zion.—עם־זו גאלת. *The people which Thou hast redeemed.* The demonstrative pronoun זה, or זו and זוּ, is, especially in poetry, used instead of the relative pronoun, when those forms are applied for the feminine and the plural also, see verse 16: עם־זו קנית; compare Ps. civ. 8; lxxiv. 2. Not in vain has God so miraculously delivered Israel from Egyptian servitude; His mighty deeds in favour of His people are a pledge that He has selected it for some glorious future; and thus is the redemption a guarantee for the safe arrival into, and the happy conquest of, Canaan; one mercy is the harbinger of other acts of graciousness. נֵהַלְתָּ, Piel of נהל, which signifies, to lead gently and cautiously, avoiding all hazards and dangers; compare Ps. xxiii. 2, and Rosenmüller on that passage. בעזך, "and not with *their* power" (*Ebn Ezra*). After נהלת, the personal pronoun אתו is omitted, see note on verse 2. אל־נוה קדשך, "to the habitation of Thy holiness," that is, to Thy holy habitation. The genitive קדשך is a circumlocution instead of the adjective, and the personal pronoun, which belongs to the whole notion, is affixed to this genitive; compare אלילי כספו, "his silver idols" (Isa. ii. 20; xxxi. 7); כלי מלחמתו, "his weapons of war" (Deut. i. 41), etc. Ebn Ezra, and others, are of opinion, that the "holy habitation" here alluded to, is Mount Sinai, on which God dwelt when He revealed the Law through Moses. But both the enumeration of the hostile tribes, which became only of importance when the Israelites attempted to enter into Canaan, and the distinct expressions of verse 17, prove sufficiently that here the Mount Moriah, and the holy temple, are hinted at. However, Canaan, or the *Holy* Land, may, likewise, as Rashbam believes, be denoted in this place, as it is sometimes called "The Habitation of God." Compare Jer. l. 19.

14. The report of the fearful judgment executed against the Egyptians, spreads such terror among the nations in and around Canaan, that they tremble before the approaching Israelites; and they partly permit them to pass through their country, and partly leave it to them as an easy prey. פלשת, is here, as in Ps. lx. 10; Isa. xiv. 29, 31, the same as ארץ פלשתים (Gen. xxi. 32), or Palestine (Παλαιστίνη, Josephus, Antiq. I. vi. 2), which consisted of a narrow tract of land along the coast of the Mediterranean, from Ekron (Josh. xiii. 3), till near the Egyptian frontier, and which bordered on the tribes of Dan, Simeon and Judah (see note on xiii. 17). The name פלשת, is, therefore, here not used, as was later the case, for the whole land; for the tribes of Canaan are, in the following verse, mentioned separately. About the use of the name Palestine, see *Reland*, Palest. p. 38, *et. seq.*

15. *Then the chiefs of Edom will be amazed.* Edom, a mountain land, intersected by rocks and cliffs, and resembling

אֱדוֹם | אֵילֵי מוֹאָב יֹאחֲזֵמוֹ רָעַד | נָמֹגוּ
כֹּל יֹשְׁבֵי כְנָעַן׃ | 16 תִּפֹּל עֲלֵיהֶם אֵימָתָה
וָפַחַד | בִּגְדֹל זְרוֹעֲךָ יִדְּמוּ כָּאָבֶן | עַד־
יַעֲבֹר עַמְּךָ יְהוָה | עַד־יַעֲבֹר עַם־זוּ
קָנִיתָ׃ | 17 תְּבִאֵמוֹ וְתִטָּעֵמוֹ בְּהַר נַחֲלָתְךָ | מָכוֹן
לְשִׁבְתְּךָ פָּעַלְתָּ יְהוָה | מִקְּדָשׁ אֲדֹנָי כּוֹנְנוּ

a natural fortress, was situated at the south-eastern frontier of Palestine, and especially of the tribe of Judah, was originally called the land of Seir, and reached, in the south, to the Elanitic Gulf of the Red Sea. Therefore, the fertile and rich tract of El-Shera, including the district of Gebal adjoining it to the north, is the territory of the ancient Moabites, which is thus, according to the Greek division, a part of Arabia Petræa. It is known, that the Edomites positively refused to allow the journey of the Israelites through their land, and thus compelled them to pass round it, under the greatest difficulties (Numb. xx. xxi; compare Judges xi. 17, *et seq.*) If our text, therefore, speaks of the terror of the Edomites, this is more a momentary effect of the divine omnipotence, without lasting consequences, just as Pharaoh showed a temporary submission after each plague, but soon hardened himself again into his old obstinacy. It is further to be remarked, that "the Edomites did not exactly *fight* against the Israelites in the desert" (*Ebn Ezra*).—*The mighty men of Moab, trembling shall seize them.* The Israelites did not, on their wanderings and marches from the Red Sea, touch the territory of the Moabites (Deut. ii. 9; Judges xi. 15, 18), by whom they were even provided with many necessaries (Deut. ii. 28); but later, after the mighty king Sihon had been subdued, the king of Moab, Balak, tried to induce the famous Balaam to curse the Israelites (Numb. xxii. etc). They lived in the east of the Dead Sea and of the Jordan, but had already before the immigration of the Israelites into Canaan, been confined by the Amorites, under their king Sihon, to the south of the river Arnon (Numb. xxi. 13, 26). From here their territory extended southwards to the "willow-brook" (נחל הערבים, Isaiah xv. 7), that is, Wadi-el-Ahsi, and formed thus a part of the present Kerrek. The Moabites were, almost uninterruptedly, in a hostile political position against the Israelites, and, in the prophetic writings, they are very frequently mentioned with menaces and imprecations, (Isa. xi. 14, 15, 16; Amos ii. 1; Zeph. ii. 8); and, in a similar sense, they are already named here. אלוף, leader of a tribe, φύλαρχος, especially used of the chiefs of the Edomites (Gen. xxxvi. 15, *et seq.*); compare, however, Zech. ix. 7; xii. 5, 6, originally only the head of the family, therefore the family itself, 1 Sam. xxiii. 23; Mich. v. 1, etc; or from אֶלֶף, chiliarch (χιλίαρχος), synonymous with שַׂר אֶלֶף, xviii. 21.—אילים, here *the mighty men*, from איל, in its original meaning, *strong* (see on ver. 11).—מוג, to flow, therefore, figuratively, to *melt*, to be *dissolved* with fear and alarm; Septuagint, ἐτάκησαν; see Ps. xlvi. 7; Am. ix. 5; Ezek. xxi. 20.

16. The terror, the anguish and consternation of the enemies, are further described. אימתה, poetically, instead of אימה, with the ה paragogicum, as in ישועתה (Jon. ii. 10), instead of ישועה, Ps. iii. 3; lxxx. 3; מותה, instead of מות, Ps. cxvi. 15; ארצה, instead of ארץ, Job. xxxiv. 13, etc.—בגדל זרועך, *by the greatness of Thy arm.* The adjective גדול, taken in the neuter gender, is here used as a substantive, and therefore it is

the mighty men of Moab, trembling will seize them; all the inhabitants of Canaan will melt away *with fear.* 16. Fear and dread will fall upon them; by the greatness of Thy arm they will be dumb as stone; till they pass, O Lord, till the people pass, which Thou hast acquired. 17. Thou wilt bring them in, and plant them in the mountain of Thy inheritance, *in* the place, O Lord, *which* Thou hast made for Thy abode, *in* the sanctuary, O Lord,

joined with זרועך, in the status constructus; thus, אמיץ כח, the strength of power, that is, the very strong power, Isa. xl. 26; Ps. xlvi. 5; compare Cant. vii. 10, יֵין הטוב.—The terror of the enemies is aptly compared with the "becoming dumb like a stone"; they will remain quiet and motionless, without in any way opposing the transit of the Israelites. The Septuagint renders, ἀπολιθωθήτωσαν, "they shall become like stone." But the translations by the imperative or subjunctive (Vulgate, "fiant immobiles," so also Nachmanides, and others), are against the context, which obliges us to take the verbs of this verse as simple future tenses.—The repetition of עד־יעבר is similar to vers. 6, 11, and is an emphatical, poetical figure; therefore, to interpret this double phrase with Targum Onkelos: "till they have crossed the Arnon and the Jordan," or to find in it, with Ebn Ezra, an allusion to the long circuitous wanderings round the mountains of Seir, is forced, and contrary to the rules of simple and rational interpretation. About זו, as a relative pronoun, see on ver. 13.—*The people which Thou hast acquired*, namely, by the redemption from Egypt; "they were servants to the Egyptians, now Thou hast acquired them to be Thy servants" (*Ebn Ezra*); compare vi. 7; xiii. 2; Deut. iv. 34; Glaire: "Que tu a *formé*," less appropriately, as this might equally apply to *all* nations.

17. The verbs of this sentence, תבאמו and ותטעמו, are, by some translators, taken as indicating a *prayer*, which is not against the context. *Planting*, signifies, figuratively, to grant a *firm*, safe abode, which has, as it were, taken deep roots. Comp. Amos ix. 15; Ps. xliv. 3; lxxx. 9.—הר נחלתך has been conjecturally understood by many as the land of Canaan. But the signification of הר in the sense of "mountainous land" is very doubtful; and the instances which have been adduced in support of this opinion are all uncertain. In Deuteronomy iii. 25, the words, ההר הטוב הזה והלבנן, signify, "this mountain, *namely*, the Lebanon;" for ו has frequently this meaning; compare 1 Sam. xxviii. 3; Ps. lxviii. 10; Am. iii. 11.; etc. In Psa. lxxviii. 54, and Isa. lvii. 13, is הר קדשו, unquestionably, the Mount Moriah. Even Ebn Ezra, although the first who has proposed to render the *land* of Canaan, seems to prefer here the signification of הר as "Mount Moriah," remarking, that this translation agrees better with the following words, "in the place which Thou hast made for Thy abode" (מכון לשבתך פעלת יי). After מכון and after אדני, the relative, אשר, is to be supplied. See note on xiii. 8. Before מכון and מקדש, the prefix, בְּ of בְּחַר, is to be understood. See on vi. 2, p. 101. מִקְּדָשׁ, with the Dagesh euphonicum in ק, stands instead of מִקְדָּשׁ, as in ii. 3 הַצְּפִּינוֹ instead of הַצְפִּינוֹ. That the allusions to the conquest of Canaan and the building of the temple, neither exclude the authorship of Moses, nor lead to a later time, as that of David or Solomon, has been observed in the prefatory remarks to this chapter, p. 260.

18. The exode from Egypt is happily effected; the tyrannical king, and the revengeful army, have become a prey of the waves; in his mind, the poet sees already the realization of his most glorious

יָדֶֽיךָ׃ 18 יְהוָ֥ה ׀ יִמְלֹ֖ךְ לְעֹלָ֥ם וָעֶֽד׃ 19 כִּ֣י
בָא֩ ס֨וּס פַּרְעֹ֜ה בְּרִכְבּ֤וֹ וּבְפָרָשָׁיו֙ בַּיָּ֔ם וַיָּ֧שֶׁב יְהוָ֛ה עֲלֵהֶ֖ם אֶת־מֵ֣י
הַיָּ֑ם וּבְנֵ֧י יִשְׂרָאֵ֛ל הָלְכ֥וּ בַיַּבָּשָׁ֖ה בְּת֥וֹךְ
הַיָּֽם׃ פ
20 וַתִּקַּח֩ מִרְיָ֨ם הַנְּבִיאָ֜ה אֲח֧וֹת אַהֲרֹ֛ן אֶת־הַתֹּ֖ף בְּיָדָ֑הּ וַתֵּצֶ֨אןָ

hopes, the possession of the land, and the erection of the sanctuary—and, inspired by the wisdom, power, and mercy of the Lord, he bursts once more forth as into an energetic pæan, "The Lord will reign for ever and ever"—and with this emphatic ejaculation the immortal song concludes.

19. For this verse does no more belong to the poem; but, forming the transition to the following narrative, it mentions once again the historical facts on which the song is based. The diction is perfectly prosaical, without rhythm or parallelism. This was already the opinion of Rashbam, whom many later commentators have justly followed. But Ebn Ezra, and others, believe that this verse forms a part of the song, and that it is intended briefly to rehearse the wonders of the Red Sea. In the Jewish Scrolls of the Law, this verse is also embodied in the song. Mendelssohn takes כי in the signification of כאשר, as Rashi already explains after the Rabbins, and translates, "This happened when Pharaoh's horse," etc. Although it is unnecessary to translate כי so circumstantially, that, or a similar sense, is, in our context, naturally implied in that conjunction.

20. *And Miriam, the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took the timbrel in her hand*, etc.... Miriam is here designated as *prophetess* (נביאה). The use of this name has the less difficulty in this instance, as it appears from Num. xii. 2, that Miriam was really considered as a prophetess in the usual acceptation of the word, however inferior her prophetic gift was to that of Moses (ver. 6). Compare *Mich.* vi. 4; and *Talm.* Sot. 12 b. But that the word נביא is also applied in a more extended sense with regard to those, who, inspired by a higher intelligence, suggest to others the words, they wish to promulgate, has been observed in our notes on iv. 6 and vii. 1, to which we refer. Still more comprehensive is the application of נביא in the meaning of *favourite* and *friend of God*, whom He uses as an instrument, to proclaim His nature and His wisdom, as, for instance, with respect to Abraham (Gen. xx. 7; in the Coran: خليل الله) or the Patriarchs (Ps. cv. 15). It is evident, that Moses is, in the Pentateuch, called נביא, because he combines in his person all those three categories or degrees (see Num. xii. 6; Deut. xviii. 15—20; xxxiv. 10).—The etymology of the word נביא, from נבא instead of נבע, signifying, *to stream forth, to speak in a flow of words*, certainly admits the meaning of *singer* or *poet*; and in this sense נִבָּא is indisputably used in several passages, as 1 Sam. x. 11; xix. 20; 1 Chron. xxv. 1, *et seq*; compare *Cicero*, De Amic. vii., and also התנבא, 1 Sam. x. 6, 10, 13. Music and recitative song were no doubt a very impressive accompaniment of the prophetic dicta; and therefore the different significations of נביא may, ultimately, have been combined in one notion; as in Latin, *vates* means both prophet and poet; and if, therefore, Samuel (according to 1 Sam. x. 5; xix. 19, 20) trained a number of *prophets* (נביאים), these might have been theocratical preachers or speakers, who were at the same time instructed in the musical delivery of their discourses, and who could thus not lack opportunities for the exercise of their poetical abilities also; and so we read in the former

which Thy hands have established. 18. THE LORD WILL REIGN FOR EVER AND EVER.—19. For the horse of Pharaoh went with its chariots and with its horsemen into the sea, and the Lord brought back the waters of the sea upon them; but the children of Israel went on dry *land* through the sea.

20. And Miriam, the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took the timbrel in her hand; and all the women went out

passage distinctly: "thou wilt meet a company of prophets coming down from the high place with a psaltery, and a tabret, and a pipe, and a harp, before them; and they will prophesy." For the sublime subjects and the solemn occasions, on which the public orator pronounced his addresses, were naturally calculated to carry him away, almost spontaneously, to a higher flight of speech, to a more elegant and even poetical diction. But, nevertheless, we are not justified in acceding unconditionally to Herder's remark, which has been too extensively adopted: "Miriam and Deborah are called prophetesses, because they were inspired poetesses; and sacred poetry was always considered as the language of the gods." This is essentially correct if limited to heathen nations, especially the Greeks and Romans, who regarded the poets, as such, standing under the influence of Apollo or the Muses, or other deities of poetry; and although Apollo was both the God of divination and of song, these two qualities were as little united by a higher, internal and necessary bond, as the various attributes of Diana or Mercury. It was different with the Hebrew prophets. Not the *language* was inspired by the deity, but the *ideas*; every prophet retained his individual style, and he expressed the thoughts which he was commanded to proclaim in the manner which appeared to him personally most effective. Among the heathens, poetical *diction* is regarded as an emanation of the gods, or as inspiration; among the Hebrews, the language is, in itself, no mark of a higher influence; for prophets were not *necessarily* poets (for instance, Abijah, Elijah, Elisha, and others), nor were the poets necessarily prophets, in the strict sense of the word (for instance, David, Solomon, and others).—Miriam is called the sister of Aaron, because, as Rashbam observes, he was her *elder* brother (compare Gen. xxviii. 9).

The hand-drum (תף, Arabic الدف Spanish, *Aduffa*, or *Doeff* and *Diff*, Tambourine; Septuagint, *τύμπανον*) consists of a hoop of wood or metal, of about one hand-breadth, and covered over with leather; it is still a very favourite instrument in the East on festive and sacred occasions (Gen. xxxi. 27; Job xxi. 12; 2 Sam. vi. 5; Is. v. 12, etc.). It is beaten by the hand, and serves especially to keep the tact in singing and dancing. It is usually played by females at public processions and in choral dances, as the instrument more generally appropriated to men was the flute (Judg. xi. 34; 1 Sam. xviii. 6; Psalms lxviii. 26, etc.). At the rim thin round bells are frequently fastened, which increase the strength of the tone. But the Egyptian timbrels were probably not provided with such bells, as the representations on monuments show, from which it also appears, that the Egyptians knew three kinds of tambourine: one was circular, another square or oblong, and the third consisted of two squares separated by a bar. Our text shows further a remarkable coincidence with Egyptian manners in the circumstance, that here also the chorus of the men sings and dances separately from that of the women. That the Egyptians frequently dance to the sound of the tambourine, without

כָּל־הַנָּשִׁים אַחֲרֶיהָ בְּתֻפִּים וּבִמְחֹלֹת׃ 21 וַתַּעַן לָהֶם מִרְיָם שִׁירוּ
לַיהוָה כִּי־גָאֹה גָּאָה סוּס וְרֹכְבוֹ רָמָה בַיָּם׃ ס 22 וַיַּסַּע
מֹשֶׁה אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִיַּם־סוּף וַיֵּצְאוּ אֶל־מִדְבַּר־שׁוּר וַיֵּלְכוּ שְׁלֹשֶׁת־
יָמִים בַּמִּדְבָּר וְלֹא־מָצְאוּ מָיִם׃ 23 וַיָּבֹאוּ מָרָתָה וְלֹא יָכְלוּ
לִשְׁתֹּת מַיִם מִמָּרָה כִּי מָרִים הֵם עַל־כֵּן קָרָא־שְׁמָהּ מָרָה׃
24 וַיִּלֹּנוּ הָעָם עַל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר מַה־נִּשְׁתֶּה׃ 25 וַיִּצְעַק אֶל־
יְהוָה וַיּוֹרֵהוּ יְהוָה עֵץ וַיַּשְׁלֵךְ אֶל־הַמַּיִם וַיִּמְתְּקוּ הַמָּיִם שָׁם

the addition of any other music, is confirmed by modern travellers (see *Niebuhr*, Trav. i. 180, *et seq.*; *Champollion*, Letters, p. 53; *Hartmann*, Die Hebräerin, iii. 372, *et seq.*; *Wilkinson*, Manners ii. 314, 315; and in general, p. 222—327; *Rosellini*, II. iii. 37, *et seq.*). Sacred music and sacred dances were also in very general use among the Egyptians from very early times. For we see further in our verse joined with the prophecy, besides the music (תפים), also the *dance* (מחלת, from חול to turn round, to dance). "What enthusiastic luxuriance this imparted to the song, when an assembled nation executed it for the glory of God, or as some public thanksgiving, full of national pride and national joy, this may be left to the feeling of every reader to represent to himself. On such occasion, not artificial, but enraptured music and language were required; no cold conventional rules fettered the souls, no northern clime constrained the tunes. The song of Moses and of Miriam, the united hymn of a delivered host of many thousands, who praise their God with the sound of timbrels and with dances under an Arabian sky; where is a song soaring aloft like this"? (*Herder*, Ebr. Poes. ii. p. 30). About the different kinds, and the nature of Oriental, especially Egyptian, dances, see *Rosenmüller*, Orient, ii. p. 19—22; *Wilkinson*, Manners ii. p. 328—340.

21. *And Miriam answered them, Sing ye to the Lord*, etc. Moses conducted the chorus of the men; so Miriam that of the women, who sang either at the end of the poem, or after its principal parts, the words, which form the beginning of the hymn, and which contain, as it were, its theme and burden in brief and expressive words, and which are therefore very much adapted for such refrain (see *supra*, p. 262). It is true that sometimes ענה does not exactly mean to *answer*, but *to begin*, to address somebody, as Deut. xxvi. 5; 1 Sam. xviii. 7; xxi. 11; and the masculine להם might well be referred to the *women* (see note on i. 21: ויעש לָהֶם בתים). But it is more appropriate to suppose, that the women really answered the men by repeating the refrain, and that להם applies to the men, especially as besides, the masculine of the *verb* follows שירו. That among many ancient, and some modern, little-civilized nations, very short pæans, incessantly repeated for hours with dance and music, are much in use, is testified by numerous travellers (see *Rosenmüller*, Orient. ii. p. 23—26).

22—25. These verses relate a miracle, which happened a few days after the transit over the Red Sea, on its eastern coast, in the desert of Shur. The waters of Marah were unpalatable on account of their bitterness; God showed to Moses a species of wood, which he threw into the fountain, and which made the water drinkable. We have here again an event, which our text evidently represents as a wonder, but which many expositors have yet tried to interpret as a natural occurrence. It is true, that such explanation

after her with timbrels and with dances. 21. And Miriam
answered them, Sing ye to the Lord, for He [1] is gloriously
exalted; the horse and its rider hath He thrown into the
sea.—22. And Moses caused Israel to journey from the
Red Sea, and they went out into the wilderness of Shur;
and they went three days in the wilderness, and found no
water. 23. And when they came to Marah, they could
not drink of the waters of Marah, for they *were* bitter:
therefore the name of it was called Marah. 24. And the
people murmured against Moses, saying, What shall we
drink? 25. And he cried to the Lord; and the Lord
showed him a tree; and he cast it into the water, and the
waters were made sweet: there He made for them a statute

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Hath triumphed gloriously.

is favoured by the fact, that in some regions trees are found, the wood of which, if thrown into bitter, saltish, or otherwise undrinkable water, makes and preserves it available and tasteful. This power possesses, for instance, the tree Nellimaram, which grows at the coast of Coromandel; further the plant Yerva Caniani in Peru, the tree Sassafras in Florida, the Perru Nelli (Phylanthus emblica) in East India; and even the Chinese are said to have originally used the tea in order to correct the bad qualities of their water. We may further remark, that Burckhardt (Trav. p. 777) throws out the conjecture (though it is not very probable), that the berries of the Gharkad (Peganarium retusum, Forsk.) might have been used to sweeten the waters of Marah. It is a low, bushy, thorny shrub, producing a small fruit, which ripens in June, not unlike the blackberry, very juicy, and slightly acidulous, and grows near the brackish fountains in and around Palestine. But according to the testimony of Niebuhr (Descript. of Arab. p. 403) there exists in Arabia, no tree which produces a similar effect on the water; in which case the inhabitants of those tracts would not omit to avail themselves of so welcome a means for improving their water, which is there, in the nitrous soil, almost invariably salinous and vitiated. We admit our text does not state, that the transmutation of the water was effected by a direct wonder, for instance, by the simple command of Moses; but that the latter applied, for that purpose, by the direction of God, a certain tree; and perhaps the special providence of God consisted here in the circumstance, that He *taught* (ויורהו) Moses that remarkable quality of the tree, whilst it was not known before, nor was discovered later. That it was any tree, which did in no way possess that virtue, is improbable, as it would be strange, to throw wood into the water as a mere *symbol* of changing its taste. Jewish tradition calls the tree הרדופני (hirdophne), the Karaites Nerium Oleander; the Arabian tradition calls it Aluah, the herb Galgant, with its root. To fix upon a certain tree is impossible, unless one possessing similar properties should be discovered in that region.—The Israelites were naturally the more vexed at the bitter waters of Marah, as they were accustomed to the incomparably agreeable water of the Nile (see note on vii. 18).—We add, however, the following narration of our event, by Josephus, who seems to point at the combination of miraculous and natural

לוֹ חֹק וּמִשְׁפָּט וְשָׁם נִסָּהוּ׃ 26 וַיֹּאמֶר אִם־שָׁמוֹעַ תִּשְׁמַע לְקוֹל ׀
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ וְהַיָּשָׁר בְּעֵינָיו תַּעֲשֶׂה וְהַאֲזַנְתָּ לְמִצְוֹתָיו וְשָׁמַרְתָּ כָּל־
חֻקָּיו כָּל־הַמַּחֲלָה אֲשֶׁר־שַׂמְתִּי בְמִצְרַיִם לֹא־אָשִׂים עָלֶיךָ כִּי אֲנִי

influence still more distinctly; and observe, that travellers have related similar procedures practised in other parts of the globe, under similar circumstances: "Moses took the top of a stick which was lying at his feet, divided it in the middle, and made the sections lengthways; he then let it down into the well, and persuaded the Hebrews that God had hearkened to his prayers, and had promised to render the water such as they desired it to be, in case they eagerly and zealously obeyed Him in what He should enjoin them to do; and when they asked what they had to do, in order to have the water changed for the better, he bid the strongest men among them who stood there, to draw up water, and told them that when the greatest part was drawn up the remainder would be fit to drink: so they laboured at it till the water was so agitated and purged as to be fit to drink." (Antiq. III. i. 2); see also 2 Kings iii. 16—18, and compare with it *Josephus*, Bell. Jud. IV. viii. 3, where Elisha changed the bitter and barren spring near Jericho, by "an earthen vessel full of salt . . . . . and proper operations of his hands after a skilful manner."

After the Israelites had reached the eastern coast of the Gulf of Suez, opposite Kolsoum (see on xiv. 1—3), they continued their march for three days in a south-easterly direction, along the coast, through deserted, sterile and hilly parts, passing by the "Well of Moses" (عيون موسى). We have already observed, on xiii. 20, that the barren region east of the head of the Gulf is called the desert of Etham or Shur, whilst the tract on both sides of it is the desert Dshofar; and Saadiah translates Shur by Dshofar, whilst Josephus (Antiq. VI. vii. 3) renders it by Pelusium. Still now a desert El-Dshofar extends between the Arabic Gulf and the Mediterranean Sea, at the western and north-western border of the desert El-Tih, from Pelusium to the south-western frontier of the old Palestine. Abulfeda (Descript. p. 13, 14) includes that desert in Egypt. It consists of white sand, has but few cultivated spots, and is about a seven days' journey in length. Now, the probable situation of Marah compels us to suppose the desert Dshofar to have extended still farther to the south than it does at present, according to modern geography. For Marah is, probably, the fountain Howarah (بيـر هوارة), which lies about eight German miles south-east of the head of the Gulf, and the bitter and saltish water of which is famous throughout the whole country, and even camels disdain it unless they are extremely thirsty. "The fountain of Howarah is situated in a rocky valley, two or three miles in diameter. It is near the centre of this valley, and springs out of the top of a mound, which has the form of a flattened hemisphere, and an elevation of, perhaps, thirty or forty feet above the general level of the valley. The water rises into a basin, which is formed by the deposit of a hard shining substance, and may be from eight to ten feet long, by a breadth somewhat less; in depth it is about five or six feet, and contains three feet of water." (*Kitto*, on ver. 23; see *Burckhardt*, ii. 777; *Robinson*, i. 106). The ancient tradition, which considers "the Well of Moses," about two German miles south-east of Suez, as our Marah, is improbable, as a journey of three days was not required for such a little distance. If, therefore, Howarah, which the caravans touch even now on their journey to the Sinai, is our Marah, and if this was indeed situated in the desert Shur, this

and an ordinance, and there He tried them; 26. And said, If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and do that which is right in His eyes, and wilt give ear to His commandments, and keep all His statutes, I will bring none of those diseases upon thee which I have brought upon the Egyptians: for I *am* the

desert must have reached along the Dshebel-er-Rahat to the beginning of the desert Sin, so that the Cape Hammam Bluff was its south-eastern boundary.

22. ויסע (Hiphil of נסע), is merely: "Moses ordered, or caused, Israel to journey," and it is, therefore, impossible to find in these words a distinct allusion to the reluctance of the Israelites to proceed with their journey.

23. *Waters of Marah.* מים ממרה, instead of מי מרה; so that מן has here the power of a genitive case, *of*; so אריה מיער, Jer. v. 6; גפן ממצרים, Ps. lxxx. 9, etc. קרא, is impersonal: "one called, it was called." The fountain seems to have had that name already *before* that time.

24. וַיִּלֹּנוּ, future Niphal of לון, signifying, *to stay* (over night), then, *to persist*, and, therefore, *to be obstinate, to murmur.*

25. *There He* [God] *made for them a statute and an ordinance* (חק ומשפט). These words find their simple explanation in the contents of the following verse: the law which God made then for the people of Israel, was, that if they continued to follow and obey Him, they would be free from all dangers and evils. We pass, therefore, by the supposition, that, besides the so-called seven laws of Noah (see on xxii. 20), the precepts of Sabbath, and the duties of filial love, were here enjoined to the Israelites, or that general directions were given to them about their conduct to each other and to the surrounding tribes, in war and peace (see Sanhedrin, 56. *b*; *Maimonides*, Moreh Nebuch. iii. 32; *Nachmanides*, on our passage).—*And there He tried them,* namely, by the want of water which they suffered, as if to try how they would bear this first privation, whether they would trust in His promises or not (see xvi. 4; Deut. viii. 16). "Besides," observes Ebn Ezra, "this first wonder, after the passage over the Red Sea, corresponds with the first plague of the Egyptians; in the one case drinkable water became undrinkable, in the other, undrinkable water became drinkable."

26. The sense of the first half of the verse, is, in general: "If you follow God's guidance;" and we need not lay too much stress upon the individual expressions, תשמע, האזנת, למצותיו, and חקיו.—*I will bring none of those diseases upon thee which I have brought upon the Egyptians.* By the *diseases* we cannot here understand real sickness, but the plagues with which the Egyptians were visited, and which were certainly still in the fresh and lively memory of the Israelites. And with the same figure the text continues: *For I am the Lord that healeth thee,* that is, who shields thee from misfortunes and dangers, and bestows happiness and prosperity upon thee. Besides, the expression רפאך (who healeth thee), is, perhaps, not unintentionally used with immediate reference to the change of the water; for, in Ezek. xlvii. 8, the phrase ונרפאו המים: "the waters were healed," is applied with regard to the sweetening of bitter and saline water. However, in other passages, as Deut. vii. 15; xxviii. 60 (compare verses 27, 35), real diseases common among the Egyptians are mentioned or alluded to, from which the Hebrews are promised to remain free if they walk in the ways of God. And we certainly are informed, from many sources, that, although the *Egyptians* were one of the healthiest and most robust nations of antiquity (*Herod.* ii. 33), the *land* was infested with peculiar and fearful epidemics.

יְהוָה רֹפְאֶךָ׃ ס חמישי 27 וַיָּבֹאוּ אֵילִמָה
וְשָׁם שְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה עֵינֹת מַיִם וְשִׁבְעִים תְּמָרִים וַיַּחֲנוּ־שָׁם
עַל־הַמָּיִם׃

Wagner (*Nat. Hist. of Man* ii. p. 270) calls it "a great and universal focus of pestilence." De Chabrol (*Déscript de l'Eg.* vii. p. 43) observes: "as the temperature of Egypt is generally uniform, and the sky mostly serene, it has but a small number of diseases, but these are mostly of a fearful character." Pestilence scarcely ever ceases in Kairo, and especially in Alexandria; dysentery causes an awful mortality, chiefly among children; at least one individual among five is infected with diseases of the eye. Volney found, in Kairo, among one hundred persons whom he met, twenty quite blind, ten wanting one eye, and twenty others whose eyes were either red, or purulent, or blemished, and the small pox rages there much more fearfully than in Europe. Compare Déscript. xiv. p. 216, where a great number of diseases prevalent in the different seasons of the year are specified.

27. From Howarah (מרה) the Israelites marched on, and arrived at Elim (אילם). The situation of this place is more distinctly defined by the statement, that there were twelve fountains or wells, and seventy palm-trees (תמרים). These circumstances agree, as nearly as possible, with the Wadi Gharendel, which is situated two and a half miles south of Howarah, and two miles north of Tor, in a very beautiful valley, of almost one English mile in length, and abounding in good water. Even according to the most recent travellers, excellent fountains and a great number of trees, especially tamarisks and palm-trees, are still found in that valley, so that it is generally chosen as one of the chief stations on the journey to Sinai. (See *Schubert* ii. 276; *Wellsted* ii. 38; *Burckhardt* ii. 779.) Shaw found there still nine fountains, and more than two thousand palm-trees; and states, that the inhabitants of Tor esteem this spot very highly as the place of encampment of Moses. The other opinions, that Elim is the Wadi Useit (*Laborde*), or the Wadi Shebekeh (*Lepsius*), have been refuted by Winer (*Bibl. Dict.* i. p. 320).—The date-, or palm-tree (תמר, φοίνιξ, Phœnix dactylifera, L.), which grew formerly in great abundance in different parts of Palestine, as around Jericho (עיר תמרים, see *Plin.*, Hist. Nat. v. 14; *Tacit.*, Hist. v. 6), Engedi, and the Dead Sea, but is now rarely found there, is still very numerously met with in Arabia, Egypt, and Persia, in which countries it was always much planted and cultivated as a most useful tree. It has been introduced in some parts of southern Europe, as in Malaga, where it thrives favourably; in some parts of France (at Bordaghière), from where generally the leaves are sold for Palm Sunday and the Jewish Passover; and in Italy, as near Genoa, where, however, it does not develop itself to any considerable degree, being here also cultivated only for the sake of the leaves, which are annually sent to the pope's chapel at Rome, where, after having been

טז 1 וַיִּסְעוּ מֵאֵילִם וַיָּבֹאוּ כָּל־עֲדַת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־מִדְבַּר־סִין

CHAPTER XVI.

Summary.—From Elim (Wadi Gharendel) the Israelites proceed in south-easterly direction to the desert Sin (in the north of Sinai, see on ver. 1), where they arrive on the fifteenth day of the second month. Threatened with famine in the sterile desert, the Israelites murmur against Moses, and repent their departure from Egypt. In this critical moment, God miraculously grants them abundant food; in the evening a great number of quails covered the ground round the camp (see on ver. 13), and in the morning the manna descended (see on vers. 2 and 15). Of this latter food so much only was to be gathered as was sufficient for the

Lord that healeth thee.—27. And they came to Elim, where *were* twelve wells of water, and seventy palm-trees: and they encamped there by the water.

blessed, they are distributed to the clerical dignitaries as a symbol of the triumph of the church. It requires a light, sandy, warm, but not dry, soil, and indicates, therefore, where it is found, the presence of water, as in the case of our text. The root neither spreads far, in proportion to the tree, nor does it descend deep in the earth. The tree attains a height of thirty or forty feet, sometimes even of sixty or one hundred feet, is often two hundred years old, and has a tall, erect, single stem, marked with a number of protuberances, which are the points of insertion of former leaves; it is about ten to eighteen inches in diameter, and not properly surrounded by a rind, but by scaly layers. "For the centre of the stem is soft and spongy, and the bundles of woody fibres successively produced in the interior are regularly pushed outwards, until the outer part becomes the most dense and hard." The tree bears about from forty to eighty thin boughs, which grow exclusively at the upper part of the stem, becoming shorter the higher they are, and, with their ends semi-circularly bending to the ground, spread their shadow afar. They stand usually by six in number around the stem, and have reedy, sword-like, evergreen leaves, of about two inches in width, and eight to twelve feet in length. Between the uppermost and the youngest branches is a pointed marrowy *heart* (ἐγκέφαλον), about two yards long, which conceals in it the germs of the new boughs and leaves. Male and female blossoms are on separate stems. In order, therefore, to be certain of their produce, an artificial system of fecundation is required, in which the exact periods are most scrupulously to be observed. For, in February, shoot from the fissures of the undermost branches, long closed husks, with a hard leather-like skin; they spring up in May, and produce blossoms in the male, and buds in the female tree. The former are then taken off, cut through lengthwise, and put on the female germs. The fruits, which come to maturity within five months, sit in numerous clusters, have the shape of acorns, but are generally larger, and covered with a thin reddish or white skin. The very various uses to which the palm-tree can be applied, in its fruits, branches, fibres, kernels, and its wood, is universally known, and has already been described by Strabo (xvi. 742). See *Winer* (Bibl. Dict. i. 252—254), who has combined the accounts of ancient geographers and modern travellers in a comprehensive picture of this remarkable tree. See, also, *Hasselquist*, Trav. in Palest. p. 540. The dates are either eaten dry, with bread and *laben* (a preparation of milk), or fried in butter, a very favourite dish of the Bedouin. (*Layard*, Discoveries, p. 291). Jewish tradition finds in the twelve wells an allusion to the twelve tribes, and in the seventy palm-trees a reference to the seventy elders; to which modern commentators add, that the wells and palm-trees are types of the twelve apostles and the seventy disciples.

Chap. XVI. 1. And they journeyed from Elim, and all the congregation of the children of Israel came to the

daily use of every family; that which was left became verminous and fetid; but the seventh day the Hebrews were commanded not to gather manna, instead of which they found on the sixth day double of their usual portions. On this occasion the institution of Sabbath was already communicated to the Israelites, although only in its *negative* bearings. As a memorial for later generations an Omer of the manna was to be collected in a vessel set apart for this purpose and preserved before the ark of the covenant. By way of anticipation, our text

אֲשֶׁר בֵּין־אֵילִם וּבֵין סִינָי בַּחֲמִשָּׁה עָשָׂר יוֹם לַחֹדֶשׁ הַשֵּׁנִי
לְצֵאתָם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 2 וַיִּלּוֹנוּ כָּל־עֲדַת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל־מֹשֶׁה

וילונו ק׳ •

mentions at the same time, that the Israelites were furnished with the manna for forty years, till after their arrival in Canaan, in the west of the Jordan (see on ver. 35).

1. If from Wadi Gharendel (Elim, xv. 28) the journey is continued to south-east along the coast, it leads, after a march of two days, into the valley of Mokatteb, which is three English miles wide, and three hours long, and lies on the principal road to Sinai. Laborde, Raumer, and others, believe this valley to be the "Desert Sin," in which the Hebrew army encamped, according to our text, one month after the exodus from Egypt. But as the Israelites gathered here the Manna in abundance (ver. 14), which is obtained from the tamarisk and the shrub Tarafa (see note on ver. 4), Rosenmüller supposes with greater probability (Antiq. iii. p. 146), that the desert Sin is identical with the Wadi esh-Sheikh, in which those trees grow in great numbers. If we proceed from Wadi Gharendel some distance along the sea, and turn then more to south-east through the Wadi Taybe and Wadi Feiran, we arrive, after three days' journey, at Wadi esh-Sheikh. It is one of the most beautiful valleys which those regions contain, and is much frequented by the Bedouins on account of its rich pastures. In no part of the peninsula are the tamarisks found so abundantly; and in the southern portion of the valley, they form a dense forest.—Robinson and Lengerke believe the desert Sin to be the waste plain, which extends from El-Murkah along the sea almost to the southern extremity of the peninsula. But it is questionable, whether the manna is there found in such quantity.—But it can in no way be justified, if some critics, as Bohlen (Genes. p. 67, Introd.), identify our Sin with the Egyptian town Sin (Ez. xxx. 15), which is unquestionably Pelusium, and was situated at the eastern mouth of the Nile. As it was, according to Strabo (xi. 491), 1500 stadia from the northern point of the Red Sea, it is evident, that that opinion is absolutely perverse.— Our text describes the situation of Sin, "between Elim (Gharendel) and the Mount Sinai," or with regard to xvii. 1, between Elim and Rephidim; and with reference to Num. xxxiii. 12, between Elim and Dophkah; and Jerome remarks: "We must not forget, that the whole deserted tract to Mount Sinai is called Sin, and that, besides, one particular place in that region might also have received the same name, just as Moab is the name both of a town and a province."—According to the list of the stations in Num. xxxiii. 10, 11, the Israelites, before arriving in the desert of Sin, encamped also "at the Red Sea." This alludes probably to the valley Taybe, through which the road of caravans passes from Wadi Gharendel to Mount Sinai, and which opens to the Red Sea (see *supra*; compare *Burckhardt* ii. 781; *Russegger* iii. 27). But that station is here omitted, as generally all those places, where no remarkable event happened. For in general, although with some important exceptions, exists, as already ancient commentators have observed, between the historical narrative and the list in Num. xxiii., a relation like that between a book of travels and a map: the latter contains the names of all places which are touched on the way, whilst the former mentions those only which offer an opportunity for interesting remarks or observations.—Tradition believes, that the Israelites arrived in Sin on a Sabbath (see *Ebn Ezra*).

2. After the people had wandered a whole month through barren districts, the stores, which they might have brought with them from Egypt, must have been exhausted, especially as no doubt a great part of their cattle had perished on the march from thirst and want of proper food

wilderness of Sin, which *is* between Elim and Sinai, on the fifteenth day of the second month after their departing out of the land of Egypt. 2. And the whole congregation of the children of Israel murmured against Moses and

(see xvii. 3). So was then the enormous host of people of more than two millions of souls left under a scorching sky, in a vast, solitary wilderness, uncheered by any reasonable hope of supporting themselves, but for a short time, in this dreadful region. And when was the end of their wanderings to be expected? whither should they turn? which people should they, with arms in their hands, force to grant them abodes? what was, therefore, under such circumstances, more natural, than that the people, still fluctuating and wavering in their belief, murmured with despondency and despair against Moses and Aaron, their leaders, reproaching them, that they had, without charge or sanction from the God of their ancestors, but induced by their own temerity or ambition, torn them from their comparatively easy and agreeable life in Egypt, where they enjoyed at least an abundance of meat and bread, and had led them away to suffer a dreadful death of starvation in the pathless desert. "We remember," they said, "the fish, which we did eat in Egypt freely; the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlick." And who can deny that, on merely human considerations, the arguments of the people were well grounded? And our sympathies will incline still stronger to the people, if we consider, that they were doomed to forty years' wanderings in a wilderness, in which at present, in its whole extent, scarcely 6000 souls can find a scanty subsistence. So observes, among numerous other writers, the modern traveller, R. Pringle: "The whole of our route lay through the country traversed by the Israelites on their way from the Red Sea to Mount Sinai, and enabled us to form a very complete notion of that part of Arabia Petraea, which must either have greatly altered in character from what it used to be, or such a multitude as composed the host of Israel could have been sustained only by a succession of the most stupendous miracles, as indeed the Scriptures give us reason to believe they were."

This question has justly engaged the attention of almost all antiquaries; for already in the second year after the exodus, the Israelites counted 603,550 males above twenty years, and 22,000 Levites above one month (Num. ii. 32; iii. 39); and where did this constantly increasing multitude find their food in the desert, besides other tribes inhabiting those regions? It is as easy as it is inadmissible, to cut off the whole problem, with Göthe, Bohlen, and others, by the groundless supposition, which is perfectly at variance with the repeated assertions of the text (Num. xiv. 33, 34; xxxiii. 38; Deut. viii. 2), that the sojourn of the Israelites in the Arabian desert is to be reduced from forty to about two years. In order to make this conjecture more plausible, Göthe asserts among other arguments: that in the list of the stations in Num. xxxiii. between Hazeroth (ver. 17) and Kadesh, or Sin (Num. xii. 16), eighteen fictitious places have been inserted, which the Israelites never passed. He continues: "Now the interpolated stations stand with the superfluous years in a happy fabulous relation. For eighteen places, about which we know nothing, and thirty-eight years about which we learn nothing, give the best opportunity, to go astray in the wilderness with the children of Israel" (compare on xiii. 17). By such arbitrary proceeding not only the whole chronology of the Hebrew history would be brought into confusion, but the difficulty would, essentially, only be diminished, not removed. For even to live *two* years in the desert with such a host is a problem beset by almost all

וְעַל־אַהֲרֹן בַּמִּדְבָּר׃ 3 וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֲלֵהֶם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מִי־יִתֵּן מוּתֵנוּ
בְיַד־יְהוָה בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם בְּשִׁבְתֵּנוּ עַל־סִיר הַבָּשָׂר בְּאָכְלֵנוּ לֶחֶם
לָשֹׂבַע כִּי־הוֹצֵאתֶם אֹתָנוּ אֶל־הַמִּדְבָּר הַזֶּה לְהָמִית אֶת־כָּל־הַקָּהָל
הַזֶּה בָּרָעָב׃ ס 4 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־

the difficulties of the original question. It cannot surprise us, that so little is reported about the journeys between the second and the fortieth year, as the Israelites wandered from district to district without coming into contact with hostile tribes, or encountering other remarkable incidents. But the following circumstances may serve to obviate the objections: 1st. By far the greater part of the period of forty years (namely thirty-six years), the Israelites lived near the populous Mount Seir and the Red Sea, where they could not fail to come into commerce with rich nations and tribes, which provided them easily with all the necessaries of subsistence: 2nd. Nearly a whole year the Israelites encamped in the fertile region around the Sinai (Numb. x. 12; compare p. 64), where the air is pure and refreshing, where fountains abound, the vegetation is luxurious, and a variety of game is found (see Numb. xi. 31): 3rd. Even the nomadic Bedouins are still now in the habit of cultivating the districts which appear suitable for agriculture; they live, during this time, in tents, and change their abodes after every harvest; thus several tribes may be met with, even now, which are, at the same time, nomads and agriculturists; and nothing forbids us to suppose the same practice among the Israelites, during their sojourn in the desert, especially as some parts of the peninsula are extremely inviting for agriculture: 4th. The Israelites brought numerous herds and flocks with them from Egypt (Exod. xii. 38; xxxvii. 3), which furnished them clothes and food of various kinds (Deut. viii. 4; xxix. 4); it is natural to assume that they did not neglect the breeding of cattle on their journeys, and even the Biblical narrative leads us to suppose, that especially the three tribes of Reuben, Gad and Manasseh, remained faithful to their former occupations, and, as proprietors of large flocks and herds, requested Moses to allot them, as their inheritance, the rich districts in the east of the Jordan, with their fertile pastures (Numb. xxxii. 1, *et seq.*; xxxiv. 14): 5th. The Israelites had no want of gold and silver, and other precious property, to buy from the commercial caravans which traversed the desert, or from the neighbouring nations, many necessaries, especially corn; a fact which is clearly alluded to in Deut. ii. 6: 6th. It is universally acknowledged, that Arabia Petræa was, formerly, considerably richer, and could maintain many more souls than is the case in its present neglected state. Various circumstances may contribute to the gradual deterioration of a country, and Arabia Petræa is not the only district in which such unfavourable change has taken place: 7th. The tribes may, either singly, or in a united body, have made excursions from Kadesh for the purpose of procuring provisions: 8th. It is well known, that the inhabitants of those climates require comparatively but little food for their subsistence and the support of their physical strength: 9th. It sufficed perfectly, if the Israelites were but scantily provided with the most necessary wants; abundance or superfluity would have led them away from their great aim, the conquest of Canaan, especially after so long wanderings, whilst the scarcity of their subsistence kept their longing after better and permanent abodes uninterruptedly alive (see Deuter. xxix. 5): Lastly, if all these natural circumstances combined should not be deemed sufficient to account for the sojourn of the Israelites

Aaron in the wilderness. 3. And the children of Israel said to them, Would to God we had died by the hand of the Lord in the land of Egypt, when we sat by the flesh-pots, *and* when we did eat bread to satisfaction; for you have brought us forth into this wilderness, to kill this whole assembly with hunger.—4. Then said the Lord to

in the desert during forty years, the holy text informs us of the constant supply of manna, a nutritious and agreeable food, with which they were abundantly furnished during that whole period. And, in this sense we read in Deut. ii. 7: "The Lord thy God hath blessed thee in all the works of thy hand; He knoweth thy walking through this great wilderness; these forty years the Lord hath been with thee; thou hast lacked nothing" comp. Deut. xxix. 4. The ketib form וילינו, for which we find in keri the Niphal וַיִּלּוֹנוּ, as in xv. 24, is either וַיַּלִּינוּ, the regular Hiphil of לון, as in xvii. 3 (וַיָּלֶן), or it is וַיְלִינוּ, after the analogy of the verbs פ״נ, as מַלִּינִים, in ver. 8, and Numb. xv. 27. Ebn Ezra observes, that a gradual increase is observable in the discontent in the Israelites; at Marah, only a part of the people had murmured, in Sin, the whole community; at the former place, against Moses only, at the latter, against both Moses and Aaron; there only for water, here for all other necessaries also, as bread and meat.

3. *Would to God we had died by the hand of the Lord in the land of Egypt.* To die "by the hand of God," signifies, in old age, and by a natural death, not by famine, as Rashbam correctly explains; others (as *Rosenmüller*) refer it more artificially to the plagues of Egypt, especially the last, the death of the first-born, by which they wished to have likewise been destroyed.—The optative mood is in Hebrew expressed, besides the future with ה paragogicum, and the particles אם and לו, by questions mostly beginning with מי יתן, and the infinitive, here מותנו, literally, "who gives our dying!" compare Judges ix. 29; Deut. v. 26; Ps. lv. 7, etc. The Israelites complained of want of meat, although they possessed much cattle (x. 26); but they could not venture to kill them in great numbers, as they would have deprived themselves of their milk, an article of the greatest importance for their subsistence.—לחם, is not only *bread*, but *food* in general; thus is לחם הפחה (Nehem. v. 18) *the provision* of the governor; and עשה לחם (Eccl. x. 19), to furnish a banquet; compare Ps. xli. 10; Job. xx. 14, etc. In this general meaning, לחם is also to be taken in ver. 4 (see note on ver. 8). This extended use of the word *bread* may have originated in the fact, that this food forms, in Asia, often the exclusive sustenance of the nomads for many successive months.—*To kill this whole assembly with hunger*, that is, the *consequence* of the inconsiderate journey into the desert, to which Moses and Aaron had, as they said, persuaded them, without the command of God, would be their death in the wilderness, although this might not have been their *intention*; compare Gen. xviii. 5.

4. In this, and the following verse, as also in vers. 14, 15, and in Numb. xi. 7—9, the descending of the manna is mentioned in a way which shows, beyond doubt, that here also a miraculous event is narrated. (About the *quails*, see on ver. 13). If we compare, and combine, the different notices of the Bible concerning the nature of the manna, we ascertain the following points: 1st. It falls from the air (ver. 4): 2nd. It descends daily (with the exception of the Sabbath): 3rd. It comes down simultaneously, or nearly so, with the dew, like which it covers the earth (ver. 14): 4th. It is *thin* (דק), *like a scale* (מחספס), or *fine*, like the hoar-frost on the earth

משֶׁה הִנְנִי מַמְטִיר לָכֶם לֶחֶם מִן־הַשָּׁמָיִם וְיָצָא הָעָם וְלָקְטוּ

(*ibid.*): 6th. It melts, if the sun shines upon it (ver. 21): 7th. It breeds maggots if preserved to the following day (verse 20): 8th. It is white, like coriander seed (ver. 31), or like bdellium (Num. xi. 7): 9th. Its taste is "like cake with honey" (ver. 31), or like "olive-cake (Numb. xi. 8): 10th. It can be ground in mills, or beaten in mortars, or baked in pans, and prepared for cakes (Numb. *loc. cit.*): and, 11th. It served the Israelites as their ordinary food during their forty years' wanderings in the desert (ver. 15).

If we compare all these circumstances with the very numerous and very detailed accounts of ancient and modern travellers, it appears evident, that the Biblical text mentions *two* sorts of manna, which have a different origin, and are in many respects distinct from each other. For that manna, which "is ground in mills or beaten in mortars," cannot be identical with that, which is white like coriander seed, and melts by the rays of the sun. We may call the one kind the manna of the air, the other, the manna of the trees and shrubs. We shall first introduce some accounts on the first species. Aristotle already observes (Hist. Nat. v. 22), "Honey falls from the air, especially at the time of the rise of the great orbs, and when the rain-bow disappears; but not before the rise of the Pleiads"; which is the case about the vernal equinox, whence the Romans call them Vergiliæ. Pliny (Hist. Nat. xi. 12), writes, "From the rise of the Pleiads, honey falls from the air, towards the dawn of the day. Then the foliage of the trees is found covered with that substance, and those who are early in the free air feel their clothes as if oiled and their hair glutinous." Avicenna (p. 212 of the Arabic text) describes the manna thus: "It is a dew, which falls upon stones or plants, has a sweet taste, becomes thick like honey, or concreted into small granular masses." And in another passage (p. 233), he speaks of a sort of honey-dew, similar to an ascending vapour, which receives in the air some natural preparation, and falls down in the night upon trees and stones, and has resemblance to honey. These observations have been fully confirmed by many travellers in the East; so, for instance, by Fabri, Shaw, Forskal, and others. About the manna of Arabia Petræa, the following passage in the travels of Breitenbach (i. p. 49) offers the best illustration: "It falls in the neighbourhood of Mount Sinai, in August and September; resembles, when fresh, the hoar-frost or the dew, and hangs in drops on leaves, herbs, boughs, and stones. When it is gathered, it curdles like pitch, but melts before the fire, and by the heat of the sun. In taste, it resembles the honey, and sticks in the teeth when it is eaten." Fabri compares it with the coriander seed; and Eurmann states, that its colour is similar to that of the snow, which appearance it keeps, if it falls on stones and boughs, but that it must be gathered before sun-rise; for it melts if exposed to the sun. We need scarcely point out, that this *air-manna* coincides in many, and in the most characteristic, features, with the properties which the Biblical text ascribes to the manna. To explain the formation of manna, no doubt a remarkable phenomenon, Oedman (Miscell. Collect. iv. p. 7) observes, "We may represent to ourselves, that the great heat in Arabia presses a great quantity of sweet juice from the trees and shrubs which grow there [see *infra*], especially from the Algul, from different sorts of Rhamnus, from the date-groves, etc., that these vapours fly in the air or rise, as long as they are specifically lighter than the atmosphere, but that they condense themselves by the coolness of the night, till, by the law of gravitation, they fall down with the dew, or rather compose with it one common substance. If they descend in a greater quantity, they must naturally form themselves into a sticky honey-like mass, which assumes still greater compactness by the frost of the night. If, after the fall of the dew, the

Moses, Behold, I shall rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather [1]every day what is

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—A certain rate every day.

watery parts of this glutinous dew evaporate, the sweet and heavy manna-substance remains, like hoar-frost or sugar; but when the rays of the sun begin to shine with greater force, these grains also melt."

This is, no doubt, a clear and acceptable theory; but it explains in no way the fact, that the manna was ground, and beaten, and cooked. In order to account for this, we are obliged to consider the *second* species of manna more minutely. There are some trees in the south of Europe and in the East, from which oozes a resinous, sweet, whitish juice, either spontaneously or by the puncture of a certain insect, which Ehrenberg calls *Coccus manniparus*. Some sorts of this manna are imported into our countries also, mostly from Calabria and Sicily, in dried grains, and are frequently applied for pharmaceutical purposes, especially as a laxative. The trees which contain this substance are, among others, the Ornus Europæa and Fraxinus rotundifolia (in Sicily and Italy ;Alhagi(frequent in the East, chiefly in two species, A. maurorum and A. desertorum); Tamarix mannifera (called by the Arabs, Guz, and Tarafa); the Gharb or Garrab (which yields the Beiruk honey, in the valley of the Jordan); the Gundeleh (which produces the Sheer-khisht manna, in Candahar); Calotropis procera (which exudes the Shukar-al-ashur); Ballot or Afs (in Mesopotamia). Before we describe some of these plants, and that insect, more in detail, we insert the following passage from Niebuhr's Description of Arabia (p. 145), in order to explain the grinding of the manna: "The manna-harvest falls, in Merdin (in Mesopotamia), in the month of August, or, as others say, in July. Observers have, after a thick fog, or if other vapours fill the atmosphere, noticed a greater quantity of it on the leaves of the trees, than when the air is pure. These trees (called Ballot, Afs, Elmses, Elmahleb, etc., belonging, probably, to the oak family), are not particularly cultivated or attended to; but when the manna falls, every one, who wishes it, is permitted to go into the forest and take as much of it as he likes, without requiring any special permission from the government or private persons. It is gathered in three different ways, and is of different quality accordingly. Some go into the forest in the morning before sun-rise, and shake the manna from the leaves upon a cloth. This manna remains quite white, and is of the most superior quality. If it is not shaken in the morning, and a warm day ensues, it melts in the heat of the sun. But it is still not quite spoiled, but accumulates on the leaves more and more, which thus grow thicker every day. Now, in order to secure this manna also, the leaves are taken home in any quantity, and thrown into boiling water, when the manna appears on its surface like oil, and can easily be taken out. But many persons do not even take that trouble, *but they beat the leaves with the manna together in mortars;* and this is the most inferior sort." The reader will easily discover the manifold parallels which this account offers with the Biblical description, and especially understand how the manna "was ground in mills, beaten in mortars, and cooked in pans."

The shrub, from which this manna is usually obtained in Asia, is the Alhagi (called by the Arabs "Camel's Horn"). It grows almost throughout the whole Orient, in Arabia Petraea, but especially between Sinai and Tor; it is of middle height, has lancet-like, blunt leaves, and blossoms of half an inch in length. From these come out glutinous legumina one inch long, which contain reddish-brown, bitter seeds. The manna of *Alhagi maurorum* is employed as a substitute for sugar, and is from Persia, where this tree grows most abundantly,

דְּבַר־יוֹם בְּיוֹמוֹ לְמַעַן אֲנַסֶּנּוּ הֲיֵלֵךְ בְּתוֹרָתִי אִם־לֹא׃ 5 וְהָיָה
בַּיּוֹם הַשִּׁשִּׁי וְהֵכִינוּ אֵת אֲשֶׁר־יָבִיאוּ וְהָיָה מִשְׁנֶה עַל אֲשֶׁר־יִלְקְטוּ
יוֹם ׀ יוֹם׃ 6 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן אֶל־כָּל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל עֶרֶב וִידַעְתֶּם
כִּי יְהוָֹה הוֹצִיא אֶתְכֶם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 7 וּבֹקֶר וּרְאִיתֶם אֶת־
כְּבוֹד יְהוָֹה בְּשָׁמְעוֹ אֶת־תְּלֻנֹּתֵיכֶם עַל־יְהוָֹה וְנַחְנוּ מָה כִּי תַלּוֹנוּ

תלינו ק׳ ◦

exported to India; it is in Persian and Arabian works called Terendshabin.—The Tarafa is an evergreen tamarisk with thorny legumina, which grows in great abundance in Wadi esh-Sheikh (see on ver. 1); but although the tamarisk is very frequent in Nubia, throughout Arabia, on the Euphrates, on the Astaboras, and in different other valleys of Asia, it seems, according to Burckhardt's testimony, that it produces manna almost exclusively in the region of Mount Sinai. Now from these plants the manna exudes either as a vegetable juice spontaneously, or by incisions or fissures, or by means of that small insect coccus, above alluded to, which scratches the boughs with its sting, and thus causes the resinous fluid to trickle out.—The coccus manniparus is an unwinged insect, about one or two lines long, bluntly cuneiform, yellow, hairy at the upper part, and chequered, with twelve ringlets on the body, feelers of nine links, six four-linked feet, and small, indistinct eyes. (Compare *Ehrenberg*, Symb. Phys. Insect. i. tab. 10).

From all this it is evident, that the holy text speaks both of the air-manna and of the tree-manna, since only the qualities of both sorts combined yield all the characteristics of the Biblical manna. At the same time, it is not only not impossible, but even probable, that the vegetable or tree-manna is frequently carried away by the air, and falls again to the ground like dew, so that in the end both kinds of manna coincide in their origin.—However, although the manna of our text has thus many qualities in common with the natural character of that substance; and thus proves anew, that God applies *natural* means for His great deeds (as in the plagues of Egypt, the passage over the Red Sea, the change of the bitter waters of Marah, and in many other instances); it is yet obvious, that here a *miracle* is narrated, from the following points: 1. The manna of the Israelites falls uninterruptedly through forty years at all seasons, whilst in reality it is only found during two or three months in the year, and in some years not at all. 2. It descends in such quantities, that the whole people of Israel is supplied with it, whereas, according to authentic reports, even in the most abundant years, the whole peninsula of Sinai yields scarcely 600 to 700 pounds, and in ordinary years not more than the third part of this quantity (*Schubert*, Trav. ii. 347). 3. It serves as the usual, nutritious and satisfying food, whilst it is in fact only a medical, relaxing substance, and would, if taken for any length of time, lead to the dissolution of the body, although it may be applied to *sweeten* the meals; nor do the Arabians use it now as an article of food. 4. It falls on the sixth day in double quantities, and on the seventh not at all. 5. It breeds worms, if it is preserved to the following day, whilst that kept from the sixth to the seventh day remains sweet and wholesome. 6. It is to the Israelites perfectly unknown, and causes their astonishment (ver. 15), and an omer full of it is preserved (ver. 32), that the posterity might see the miraculous bread of their ancestors; and in the same sense it is called a food, which their fathers had never known (Deut. viii. 3). As such miraculous bread the manna is mentioned throughout the Old Testament; it is called "celestial bread" (לחם שמים Psalms, cv. 40); or similarly: "heavenly

sufficient for the day, that I may try them, whether they
will walk in my law or not. 5. And it shall come to pass,
that on the sixth day, if they will prepare *that* which they
bring in, it shall be double of *that* which they gather daily.
6. And Moses and Aaron said to all the children of
Israel, In the evening, then you shall know that the Lord
hath brought you out from the land of Egypt: 7. And
in the morning, then you shall see the glory of the Lord;

food" (דגן שמים, Ps. lxxviii. 24, although the Arabians call it also من السما "heavenly gift"); and in Ps. lxxviii. 4 it is enumerated among the wonders, which God did for Israel (compare Nehem. ix. 20). About the name see on ver. 15.—As the reason, why so unsubstantial a food was chosen as the chief means of subsistence of the Israelites for so long a period, is mentioned in Deut. viii. 3, that Israel may learn, "that man does not live by bread alone, but by everything which the word of God produces"; that, therefore, God may apply whatever means He pleases to maintain His creatures. And thus the sacred text itself alludes to the higher typical meaning which the manna is intended to convey, and invites to a symbolical interpretation. The providence of God manifests itself chiefly in supporting all the numberless beings which people the universe. He gives to everybody his food in due time; but because He sends it through agents and messengers, man is apt to forget that it proceeds from Him, who is the source of everything created; because He conceals Himself in the veil of nature or natural events, man is prone to ascribe his daily support to this concatenation of external occurrences, and to speak himself free from every duty of gratitude towards Providence. But in order to teach the released people immediately after its entrance into the inhospitable and barren desert, that great truth that He alone is the bestower of all earthly gifts, that the maintenance of every individual is in reality one uninterrupted series of miracles, and that He may use any medium, however insignificant in appearance, to maintain His creatures; God applied the light food of the manna to remind them every day anew of His watching Providence, of His goodness and His omnipotence; and He thus prepared them practically to comprehend the first and fundamental doctrine of every true and pure religion.—We abstain from further allegorical applications, in which many commentators, tempted by the fruitfulness of the subject, have extensively and often vainly indulged.

God will *try* the Israelites by the manna, and see, whether they would indeed, with contentment and confidence, gather *every day only as much as was necessary for them* (דבר־יום ביומו), nor leave anything to the following day (ver. 19), or whether they would feel tempted to go out on Sabbath also to gather (ver. 26); in a word, whether they would *walk in the law* and follow the command of the Lord.

5. On the sixth day after the first supply of the manna, they shall examine (והכינו) that which they bring home, and they will find that they have gathered *double* the quantity (משנה, from שנה to repeat; Onkelos, על חד תרין, two instead of one) of that which they have collected on the previous days, that is two omers (ver. 22). The construction of ו in והכינו, is the same as in חם השמש ונמס in ver. 21, which see.—The verb והכינו, has not that connection with ver. 23, which Rashbam supposes.

6, 7. The following words of Moses have a deeper background. After the deliverance at the Red Sea, the Israelites had learned to identify the cause of God

עָלֵינוּ׃ 8 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה בְּתֵת יְהוָה לָכֶם בָּעֶרֶב בָּשָׂר לֶאֱכֹל
וְלֶחֶם בַּבֹּקֶר לִשְׂבֹּעַ בִּשְׁמֹעַ יְהוָה אֶת־תְּלֻנֹּתֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר־אַתֶּם
מַלִּינִם עָלָיו וְנַחְנוּ מָה לֹא־עָלֵינוּ תְלֻנֹּתֵיכֶם כִּי עַל־יְהוָה׃
9 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־אַהֲרֹן אֱמֹר אֶל־כָּל־עֲדַת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל קִרְבוּ
לִפְנֵי יְהוָה כִּי שָׁמַע אֵת תְּלֻנֹּתֵיכֶם׃ 10 וַיְהִי כְּדַבֵּר אַהֲרֹן
אֶל־כָּל־עֲדַת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּפְנוּ אֶל־הַמִּדְבָּר וְהִנֵּה כְּבוֹד יְהוָה
נִרְאָה בֶּעָנָן׃ פ ששי
11 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 12 שָׁמַעְתִּי אֶת־תְּלוּנֹּת בְּנֵי

with that of Moses, and to look upon the latter as the true messenger of the former (xiv. 31). In the privations which they had already suffered since that event, they felt an inducement to separate again the guidance of Moses from the providence of God, who, they believed, would lead them, without trouble or vexation, into a happy country. They murmured, therefore, against Moses (ver. 2), without, however, disowning God's power (ver. 3, ביד־יי). It is, therefore, the intention of Moses, to prove to the Israelites again, that God is the immediate ruler of their destinies, and that he himself, and Aaron, are but His feeble instruments. Although the brothers lost thus in worldly greatness, they rose high in heavenly dignity, and the cause of Israel appeared again as thoroughly divine. This murmuring of the people, which is thus not directed against Moses, but against God Himself, assumes a still more criminal character. The proof of that truth shall now be more openly displayed, by the miraculous supply of quails in the evening, and of manna in the morning, and the glory of God will manifest itself to the disheartened hosts. The substantives ערב and בקר, are absolute accusatives, which, as in Arabic, have the signification of adverbs: "in the evening," and, "in the morning." After these expressions of time, the verb finite follows usually with ו: וידעתם and וראיתם. It is self-evident, from this symmetrical construction, that the words ובקר וראיתם, belong together (see ver. 12), and that they cannot be separated, as Ebn Ezra believes, who supplies, after ובקר, again from the preceding verse, the words, כי יי׳ הוציא אתכם.—*The glory of the Lord*, that is, His might, to give you, even in this wilderness, unexpectedly your sustenance (compare xiv. 17; Numb. xiv. 22), whilst in ver. 10, the same expression signifies the deity in its supernatural splendour, which manifests itself to the mortal eye.—*What are we*, namely, able or capable to perform? We execute only that which God bids us to do. About תלונו, see on ver. 2.

8. This verse is closely to be combined with the preceding one, which it is intended to illustrate; at the same time it represents a former idea in a new light, and the logical connection is this: when God will send you food in the evening and in the morning, His glory will impress itself upon your minds; at the same time, the nature of that food, and the manner in which you will obtain it, will be a new proof that not *we* (Moses and Aaron), in our weakness, but God in His omnipotence and wisdom, has led you from Egypt, and so your murmuring against me falls back upon *Him*. Therefore, before בתת, and בשמע, some idea is to be understood like this: "and this majesty of God will exhibit itself to you when . . . ." In our verse, בשר, meat, and לחם, bread, appear really to be used

[1]when He heareth your murmurings against the Lord: and what *are* we, that you murmur against us? 8. And Moses said, *This shall be*, when the Lord will give you in the evening flesh to eat, and in the morning bread to satisfaction; when the Lord heareth your murmurings which you murmur against Him: and what *are* we? Your murmurings *are* not against us, but against the Lord.—9. And Moses spoke to Aaron, Say to all the congregation of the children of Israel, Approach before the Lord; for He hath heard your murmurings. 10. And it came to pass, as Aaron spoke to the whole congregation of the children of Israel, that they [2]turned towards the wilderness, and behold, the glory of the Lord appeared in the cloud.—11. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 12. I have heard the murmurings of the children of Israel: speak to them, saying, [3]Towards the evening

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—For that he. [2] Looked. [3] At even.

in their usual and more limited meaning, whilst in ver. 3, לחם is applied as the generic, and בשר as the specific notion, so that the literal reference to ver. 3, which has, by some interpreters, been found in our verse, is but in appearance.—The particle כי, has, after a negation, the signification of an adversative conjunction, *but*, and is, in this sense, frequently coupled with אם.—The order of the verses of this chapter has been attacked, especially from the circumstance, that in ver. 4, the manna alone (לחם) seems to be promised, whilst here the animal food also is mentioned, wherefore, some propose to place vers. 11, 12 immediately after ver. 3 (*Houbigant*, *Vater*, *Herxheimer*, and others). However, the whole difficulty disappears if we take in ver. 4 also, לחם in its wider sense, as food in general, so that it comprises the promise of the quails also, and the progress of the narrative is therefore this: promise of God to Moses and Aaron concerning the manna and the quails, vers. 4, 5; then announcement of this promise to the people through the brothers, vers. 6—9; and, lastly, its ratification by a divine apparition, on which solemn occasion God repeats, *to Moses alone*, His previous assurance, vers. 10—12; so that the economy of this section is perfectly logical.

9, 10. The pillar of the cloud, which, during the day, passed constantly before the army of the Israelites (xiii. 22), was to them the visible sign of divine guidance, and now, when a new extraordinary miracle, clearly announced, was to be granted and confirmed to them, they are very appropriately and impressively requested to rally round that sacred symbol, in order to accept, as it were, from God Himself, the certainty of the promise. But the pillar of the cloud was, as the Israelites had alienated themselves from their God by their murmuring, "farther before them in the desert," and they "approached" it now (קרבו, ver. 9), or they "turned" towards it (ויפנו, ver. 10), and saw the majesty of God in the cloud (see on ver. 7).

11, 12. According to Ebn Ezra, this is a second revelation of God to Moses, which was granted to him on the same subject, as an acknowledgment of the reverential spirit with which the Israelites

יִשְׂרָאֵל דַּבֵּר אֲלֵהֶם לֵאמֹר בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם תֹּאכְלוּ בָשָׂר וּבַבֹּקֶר
תִּשְׂבְּעוּ־לָחֶם וִידַעְתֶּם כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃ 13 וַיְהִי בָעֶרֶב
וַתַּעַל הַשְּׂלָו וַתְּכַס אֶת־הַמַּחֲנֶה וּבַבֹּקֶר הָיְתָה שִׁכְבַת הַטַּל סָבִיב
לַמַּחֲנֶה׃ 14 וַתַּעַל שִׁכְבַת הַטָּל וְהִנֵּה עַל־פְּנֵי הַמִּדְבָּר דַּק
מְחֻסְפָּס דַּק כַּכְּפֹר עַל־הָאָרֶץ׃ 15 וַיִּרְאוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמְרוּ
אִישׁ אֶל־אָחִיו מָן הוּא כִּי לֹא יָדְעוּ מַה־הוּא וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה

looked upon the glory of God appearing to them. However, it seems rather, that the promise of the miraculous food is here repeated to Moses alone, in the presence of the people, because he was properly the medium between Him and the people.—About בין הערבים, which is here used synonymously with בערב (vers. 6, 8, 13), see our note on xii. 6.

13. Our verse relates to the first kind of food with which the Israelites were supplied, the *quails* (שלו). The exact species of birds, designated by the name שלו, has been a long-disputed question, which is, however, at present almost settled. Partly the comparison with the kindred dialects, partly the circumstance that שלו is, in Psalm lxxiii. 27, called עוף כנף, "a winged bird," have assisted in clearing up this subject. The latter designation would by no means apply to *locusts*, which Ludolph, Patrick, and others, believe to be meant by שלו. Nor is the "flying-fish" (Trigla Israelitarum, *Ehrenberg*) more adapted to our text; they can hardly cover the whole camp; they do not move far from the coast; nor can they serve as an ordinary food, but are only applied to certain medical preparations. Now, in Arabic, سلوى is *quail;* Josephus calls the bird here mentioned ὄρτυξ (quail), and refers to the event of our text in the following manner (Antiq. III. i. 5): "A little later, a vast number of quails, which is a bird more plentiful in this Arabian Gulf than anywhere else, came flying over the sea; and, wearied with their laborious flight, and coming nearer to the earth than other birds, they fell down upon the Hebrews. And they caught them and satisfied their hunger with them, convinced that God had supplied them with this food." Both ancient and modern geographers agree about the abundance of quails in those regions. So says Diodorus Siculus (Lib. i. p. 38, ed. Rhodom.): "The inhabitants (of Arabia Petræa) prepared long nets, spread them near the coast for many stadia, and caught thus a great number of quails, which come hither in large troops from the sea." Similarly, Prosper Alpinus, Hasselquist, Shaw, and others. Besides the common quail (Tetrao coturnix, cot. dactylisonans), in those parts another large species is found, which the Arabians call *kata*, and, in the system of Linnæus, bears the name Tetrao (Israelitarum) Alchata. It abounds in Arabia Petræa, Judæa, and the former territories of Edom and Moab, where it is, especially in May and June, the season of our event, found in enormous numbers. It is of the size of a turtle-dove; has a short, curved, yellow bill, marked with a white spot at the end; ash-grey neck and head; reddish body and back; cuneiform tail; and feathered legs; and must, therefore, properly, be ranged among the grouse family. The Septuagint renders שלו by ὀρτυγομήτρα, which is, "quail-king" (roi de cailles, or, properly, mother of quails, that is, large quail), and which is said to lead the migrations of the quails (*Plin.*, Nat. Hist. x. 33). Thus it is interpreted by Philo, and others also. Although this bird belongs, according to accurate observations, to another family, that of the "Rallus" (*Oken* ,Zoolog. ii. 906), it is so similar to

you shall be satisfied with bread, and you shall know that
I *am* the Lord your God. 13. And it came to pass, that
in the evening the quails came up, and covered the camp:
and in the morning the dew lay round about the [1]camp.
14. And when the dew which lay had risen, behold, there
was upon the face of the desert [2]something small, pealed,
as small as the hoar-frost on the earth. 15. And when
the children of Israel saw *it*, they said one to another,
[3]What *is* that? For they knew not what it *was*. And

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Host. [2] A small round thing, *as* small, etc. [3] It is manna.

the quail, that it rather confirms this acceptation. The opinion of Targum Jonathan, who understood by שְׂלָו pheasants (פִּסְיוֹנִין), requires no refutation.—*And covered the camp.* According to Numb. xi. 31, the quails (like the locusts, x. 13) are "brought by a wind from the sea," and they are scattered over the camp, "a day's journey on this side, and a day's journey on the other side, and two cubits high upon the face of the earth." In Psa. lxxviii. 26, 27, the same event is thus described: "He [God] caused an east-wind to blow in the heaven: and by His power He brought in the south-wind. He raised flesh upon them as dust, and feathered fowls like the sand of the sea." And Buffon (Hist. Nat. iii. 1) observes, with regard hereto: "We see, even, that the Creator of the Universe employed this means (the wind), as that most in conformity with the general laws established by Himself, for sending vast numbers of quails to the Israelites in the desert. This south-east wind blows, indeed, in Egypt, in Ethiopia, on the coasts of the Red Sea, and, in a word, in all those regions where the quails abound." (Compare *Sonnini*, Trav. ii. p. 414; *Stolberg*, Hist. of Rel. ii. p. 143). However, the miraculous character of this event must be sought, both in the unusual abundance of those birds, and in their arrival just at the time when the Hebrew camp was nearly despairing, and when such an event was, naturally, the least to be expected.—Now, in the morning was around the camp שִׁכְבַת הַטָּל, properly, "a layer of dew," that is, the dew had already fallen in the morning, and covered the ground. This expression is, therefore, not, as Ebn Ezra asserts, identical with בְּרֶדֶת הַטַּל, in Numb. xi. 9, "when the dew came down."

14. And when the layer of dew which covered the earth had risen and evaporated, the thin white manna, which had fallen almost simultaneously with the dew was seen upon the ground (Numb. xi. 9). According to Rashi, and others, first dew had fallen, then manna over the dew, and then dew again over the manna, so that the manna was enclosed between two layers of dew, as in a capsule (בקופסא). We need scarcely remark, that the text offers no hint to such conception.—מחספס, from the quadriliterum חספס, derived from חסף=חשף, to strip off, to peel, to scale, and so also Onkelos, מקלף, and the Syriac Version. The translations of the Septuagint, ὡσεὶ κόριον, "like coriander" (compare Numb. xi. 7); the Vulgate, "quasi pilo tusum;" Saadiah, "round" (as the English Version also has), are mere conjectures; but the opinion of Michaelis, which has been adopted by Rosenmüller, and others, that it is kindred with خشف, hard snow, a little frozen, so that it would signify *snow-like*, has been refuted by Gesenius, in his Thesaurus, *sub* חסף.

15. About the nature, and the different sorts of the manna, see on ver. 4. The Israelites, seeing the ground covered with it, exclaim: מָן הוּא, which words,

אֲלֵהֶם הוּא הַלֶּחֶם אֲשֶׁר נָתַן יְהוָה לָכֶם לְאָכְלָה׃ 16 זֶה הַדָּבָר
אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה לִקְטוּ מִמֶּנּוּ אִישׁ לְפִי אָכְלוֹ עֹמֶר לַגֻּלְגֹּלֶת
מִסְפַּר נַפְשֹׁתֵיכֶם אִישׁ לַאֲשֶׁר בְּאָהֳלוֹ תִּקָּחוּ׃ 17 וַיַּעֲשׂוּ־כֵן בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּלְקְטוּ הַמַּרְבֶּה וְהַמַּמְעִיט׃ 18 וַיָּמֹדּוּ בָעֹמֶר וְלֹא הֶעְדִּיף

if they are combined with the explanation immediately following: "for they did not know *what* (מה) it was," evidently signify: "What is that?" so that מן, is a Chaldaizing form, instead of מה, which was perhaps used in vulgar phraseology; and Chaldaisms are not unfrequent in the Old Testament, for instance, Gen. xxxi. 47, יגר שהדותא. Thus translates the Septuagint, Τί ἐστι τοῦτο; the Syriac Version, מנו, "What is it?" the Vulgate, "Manhu—quod significat, quid est hoc?" and Josephus (Antiq. III. i. 16) says: "Now the Hebrews call this food *manna*, for the word *man*, is, in our language, a question, *What is this?*" And the substance preserved the name by which it was first introduced; and already in ver. 33, an omer of *manna* is mentioned (see also ver. 35). Rashbam considers מן as an Egyptian word, merely because that language was then the most familiar to the Israelites, without, however, attempting to prove this assertion. But, if we consider the word מן, irrespective of the contents of our verse, the most natural explanation offers itself from the Arabic, where the same object is called مَن, that is, *a gift*, or *present*, or more fully, من السما, the gift of heaven (compare לחם שמים, and דגן שמים, on ver. 4); with which etymology agrees the derivation of מָן, from מנה, to allot, to assign; and thus explains Kimchi: "As they did not know the name, they called it *man*, that is a present, and a gift from the Almighty." Similarly, the Persian translator: "it is a divine gift." Webster (Dictionary, *s. v.*) compares *Manna* with the Arabic مونة (from مان), provisions for a journey, and with the Irish *mann*, which signifies wheat, bread, or food; but he defends the rendering of the English Version: "it is manna," which would make this whole verse singularly contradictory; for the Hebrews could not call it by a certain name, if "they knew not what it was." Evidently to obviate such objection, Faber explains: "The Israelites asked, 'Is this manna?' for they knew the name, without having ever seen the object itself." But it is clear, that this is no successful attempt to bring the different parts of our verse into harmony with each other. It is neither grammatically nor logically unforced. The same must be said of another interpretation adopted by several commentators, that the Israelites believed the food, which lay spread before them, to be identical with the natural manna, which was known to them, and that, therefore, Moses, correcting their mistake, informed them, in the following words, that it was *heavenly* food.

16. Every one shall gather *in proportion to his eating*, לפי אכלו, a common use of לפי. The Septuagint translates freely: Ἕκαστος εἰς τοὺς καθήκοντας, and the Vulgate, only expressing the sense: "quantum sufficit ad vescendum." Every individual was to gather one omer (עמר לגלגלת). The measures in use among the ancient Hebrews, for *dry* goods, were: 1st. the *homer* (חמר or כר, Ezek. xlv. 11, 14, κόρος), containing ten *baths* (בת, βάτος). The bath (which is, however, only used for liquids), is, according to Josephus (Antiq. VIII. ii. 9), equal to seventy-two *xestæ* (ξέσται), that is, one Attic metretes; and this holds, according to Böckh (Metrolog. Untersuch. p. 278), 1993·95 Parisian cubic inches. But, according to the Rabbins, one *log* (לג) is equal to six hen's eggs of

Moses said to them, This *is* the bread which the Lord hath given you for food.—16. This *is* the thing which the Lord hath commanded, gather of it every man according to his eating, an omer for every head, *according* to the number of your persons; take every man for those who are in his tent. 17. And the children of Israel did so, and gathered; [1]those who *gathered* more, and those who *gathered* less. 18. And when they did mete *it* with an

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Some more, some less.

middle size, probably (according to *Thenius*), not the shells, but only the contents of the eggs. Now, a *log* is the seventy-second part of a bath, for a bath contains six *hins* (הין), and a hin, twelve logs, therefore the *bath* holds 1014·39 Parisian cubic inches; which amount agrees better with the different passages of the Bible than the larger one stated above: 2nd. The *Lethech* (לתך, Hosea iii. 2), which is, according to the Septuagint, and the Vulgate, half a *homer* ἡμιόκορος): 3rd. The *ephah* (איפה), the tenth part of the *homer*, and is, therefore, the same measure as the *bath* is for liquids (Ezek. xlv. 11): 4th. The *seah* (סאה), according to the Septuagint and the Rabbins, the third part of the ephah, (compare Matt. xiii. 33, and Gen. xviii. 6; *Josephus* Antiq. IX. iv. 5): 5th. The *omer* (עמר), which is, as appears from the 36th verse of our chapter, the tenth part of the ephah, wherefore it is frequently called עשרון (Levit. xiv. 10; Numb. xv. 4): and, 6th. The *kab* (קב; 2 Kings vi. 25), according to the Rabbins, the sixth part of the *seah*, or four *xestæ* (compare *Josephus*, Antiq. IX. iv. 4); therefore the homer is the greatest, the log, the smallest measure, and their relation to those which lie between them is as follows: 1 homer is equal to 10 baths or ephahs, 30 seahs, 60 hins, 100 omers, 180 kabs, 720 logs. Now, as a log contains as much as six eggs, the ephah (or bath) contains $6 \times 72 = 432$ eggs, and therefore is an omer equal to 43⅕ eggs (or about four pints, English); see on ver. 36. According to Josephus (Antiq. IX. iv. 4, 5, compared with VIII. ii. 9), the ephah is equal to 1985·77 Parisian cubic inches, and therefore the omer is equal to 198·577. In Antiq. III. vi. 6, Josephus states, that a omer contains seven Athenian cotylæ, each of which is equal to six cyathi, or nearly half a pint English. But Thenius has reduced these measures, with probability, to 1014·39, and 101·439 (see *supra*); comp. *Thenius*, Die althebräischen Längen—und Hohlmaasse; *Bertheau*, Zur Israelitischen Geschichte, p. 50, *et seq.*; *Winer*, Bibl. Dict ii. p. 40—42. It can be gathered, from several passages of the Mishnah and the Talmud, that the measures were, in later times, enlarged (compare *Peah*, viii. 5; and *Edujoth*, i. 2, on the kab; *Menah.*, vii. 1, on the seah; *Menah.*, ix. 2, on the log), although their proportion to each other remained unaltered.—גלגלת, properly, *skull* (from גלל, to be round), is almost used like a personal pronoun for *man, individual*, as sometimes ראש (Judg. v. 50). In a similar manner נפש is applied, and, with respect to God, כבוד.—מספר וכ׳, *according to the number of.* The accusativus absolutus is used in such or similar adverbial expressions, as שכם אחד, with one mind, unanimously (Zeph. iii. 9).

17. And they gathered המרבה והממעיט, he who gathered much, and he who gathered little. The Septuagint, Vulgate, Luther, English Version, and others, translate: "they gathered, *some more, some less*," as if the text were זה מרבה וזה ממעיט; but the definite article before the participles compels us to understand them as relative sentences.

18. The miraculous and heaven-sent

הַמַּרְבֶּה וְהַמַּמְעִיט לֹא הֶחְסִיר אִישׁ לְפִי־אָכְלוֹ לָקָטוּ׃ 19 וַיֹּאמֶר
מֹשֶׁה אֲלֵהֶם אִישׁ אַל־יוֹתֵר מִמֶּנּוּ עַד־בֹּקֶר׃ 20 וְלֹא־שָׁמְעוּ אֶל־
מֹשֶׁה וַיּוֹתִרוּ אֲנָשִׁים מִמֶּנּוּ עַד־בֹּקֶר וַיָּרֻם תּוֹלָעִים וַיִּבְאַשׁ וַיִּקְצֹף
עֲלֵהֶם מֹשֶׁה׃ 21 וַיִּלְקְטוּ אֹתוֹ בַּבֹּקֶר בַּבֹּקֶר אִישׁ כְּפִי אָכְלוֹ
וְחַם הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ וְנָמָס׃ 22 וַיְהִי ׀ בַּיּוֹם הַשִּׁשִּׁי לָקְטוּ לֶחֶם מִשְׁנֶה
שְׁנֵי הָעֹמֶר לָאֶחָד וַיָּבֹאוּ כָּל־נְשִׂיאֵי הָעֵדָה וַיַּגִּידוּ לְמֹשֶׁה׃
23 וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם הוּא אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה שַׁבָּתוֹן שַׁבַּת־קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה

food showed itself wonderful in all its relations. Everybody gathered the manna after his abilities or his judgment, and when he returned to his tent, and measured what he had gathered, he who had little, found yet that he had for every member of his family not less than an omer, and he who brought home much, saw that he had not gathered more than one omer for every individual of his house; or, whether they had individually gathered much or little, yet when they came home, put together, and then shared what they had gathered, they found, that there was for every one not more, and not less than an omer.

19. In order to remind the Israelites daily anew of the unremitting providence of God, they should leave nothing of their manna till the following morning, or what was left destroy, firmly relying that God would provide them every day with their necessary sustenance.

20. אנשים is an indefinite pronoun, *some of them*, according to tradition again Dathan and Abiram (see on ii. 13, and iv. 19).—וירם תולעים, literally: "and it became putrid with worms." וירם from רמה, to become putrid, thence רמה, worm (ver. 24). The accusative תולעים denotes the object, into which the manna was converted by putrefaction; thus Is. xxxiv. 13, ועלתה ארמנתיה סירים, literally, "its castles will rise as thorns," that is, the castles will be converted into thorn-fields. Such accusatives expressing the effect of the action of the verb are especially used, as an apposition, after the verbs of flowing, as נטף, נזל, שטף, etc., as in Greek, for instance, *δάκρυα στάζειν*. Compare on xii. 39.—וַיָּרֻם is used instead of וַיָּרָם, probably in order to distinguish it from the future of רום, to be high; compare Judg. ix. 53, וַתָּרִץ instead of וַתָּרֶץ.—Ebn Ezra and Rashi find in the order of the verbs וירם and ויבאש, a *hysteron proteron*, as the manna must first have become fetid and then putrid, which is, however, of no great significance.

21. בבקר בבקר. Numerals and expressions of time, if repeated, assume a distributive meaning: every morning. Compare Psalms lxv. 9, and lxviii. 20: יום יום; Esth. ii. 11, and iii. 4: יום ויום, etc.; שנים שנים, Gen. vii. 9, 15.—That both the tree-manna, and the air-manna melt, or at least curdle when the sun shines upon it, is confirmed by all travellers (see on ver. 4). "And *when* the sun grew hot (וחם), it melted." About this use of ו instead of אם, see on iii. 13, p. 51.

22. The sense of this verse is easily discernible from the context: God had already, at the first announcement of the manna, in ver. 5, communicated to Moses that the Israelites, when preparing, that is, measuring the quantity brought home, would find, that they had gathered double the usual quantity. It is to be supposed that Moses informed the people of this circumstance, although our text does not relate it, and there are numerous instances, that God gave commands to Moses, without their communication to

omer, he who gathered much had nothing over, and he who gathered little had no lack; they gathered every man according to his eating. 19. And Moses said, Let no man leave of it till the morning. 20. Notwithstanding they hearkened not to Moses; but some of them left of it until the morning, and it [1]became putrid with worms, and smelled offensively: and Moses was angry with them. 21. And they gathered it every morning, *every* man according to his eating; and when the sun grew hot, it melted. 22. And it came to pass, *that* on the sixth day they gathered double bread, two omers for one *man*: and all the chiefs of the congregation came and told *it* to Moses. 23. And he said to them, This *is* *that* which the

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Bred worms.

the people being mentioned; and this supposition is in our case confirmed by the first part of the following verse, from which the acquaintance of the Israelites with the precepts concerning the Sabbath is clearly obvious: "That is that, which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is a day of rest, holy rest to the Lord."—Now that prediction was, indeed, found realized on the sixth day; they saw that they had gathered a double measure of manna; and, therefore, the representatives of the congregation went to Moses to inform him of the fact, and to enquire, how they should act after such a remarkable occurrence, upon which Moses answered: "Bake that, which you will bake," etc. (ver. 23); and especially to ascertain, whether that manna, which they would leave to the following morning, would remain eatable, to which Moses replied: "and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning."—Rashi is of opinion, that Moses had forgotten to acquaint the Israelites of the laws concerning the Sabbath, which is, however, by no means probable; and Ebn Ezra believes, with as little plausibility, that Moses had simply commanded them to gather on the sixth day double portions, without, however, assigning any reason for this injunction.—According to tradition, the manna for the Sabbath was, in smell and taste, superior to that gathered on the other days.—The נשיאי העדה, "the chiefs of the congregation," are probably the same, who are in xii. 21; xvii. 5, called the elders.

23. We find here already a short allusion to the institution of Sabbath, which is, next to the Passover, the second great national *sign of covenant*, between God and Israel. Before this period, the Israelites did probably not observe this day as a time of rest and recreation. But the occasion on which it is here introduced is admirably calculated to disclose the internal end of the Sabbath, which is the perfect harmonizing and reconciling of the material and spiritual life of man. Now, the minds of the Israelites were in the desert of Sin, entirely engrossed by cares and thoughts for physical subsistence. The mentioning of the Sabbath, was, therefore, intended to call their exclusive attention away from earth, and to direct it, for a day at least, to heaven, lest the people, absorbed in external pursuits, forget the true task of their lives, and in prosecuting the means lose the aim. (See our remarks on xx. 8—11).—"That which you are accustomed to bake and to seethe every day, namely, one omer, that you shall bake

מָחָר אֵת אֲשֶׁר־תֹּאפוּ אֵפוּ וְאֵת אֲשֶׁר־תְּבַשְּׁלוּ בַּשֵּׁלוּ וְאֵת כָּל־
הָעֹדֵף הַנִּיחוּ לָכֶם לְמִשְׁמֶרֶת עַד־הַבֹּקֶר׃ 24 וַיַּנִּיחוּ אֹתוֹ עַד־
הַבֹּקֶר כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה מֹשֶׁה וְלֹא הִבְאִישׁ וְרִמָּה לֹא־הָיְתָה־בּוֹ׃
25 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אִכְלֻהוּ הַיּוֹם כִּי־שַׁבָּת הַיּוֹם לַיהוָה הַיּוֹם לֹא
תִמְצָאֻהוּ בַּשָּׂדֶה׃ 26 שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תִּלְקְטֻהוּ וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שַׁבָּת
לֹא יִהְיֶה־בּוֹ׃ 27 וַיְהִי בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי יָצְאוּ מִן־הָעָם לִלְקֹט וְלֹא
מָצָאוּ׃ ס 28 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה
עַד־אָנָה מֵאַנְתֶּם לִשְׁמֹר מִצְוֹתַי וְתוֹרֹתָי׃ 29 רְאוּ כִּי יְהוָה נָתַן
לָכֶם הַשַּׁבָּת עַל־כֵּן הוּא נֹתֵן לָכֶם בַּיּוֹם הַשִּׁשִּׁי לֶחֶם יוֹמָיִם
שְׁבוּ אִישׁ תַּחְתָּיו אַל־יֵצֵא אִישׁ מִמְּקֹמוֹ בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי׃ 30 וַיִּשְׁבְּתוּ
הָעָם בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִעִי׃ 31 וַיִּקְרְאוּ בֵית־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־שְׁמוֹ מָן וְהוּא

and seethe to-day also; but the remaining omer preserve till to-morrow," explains Ebn Ezra, perhaps too literally urging the words of the command. Nor is the interpretation of Onkelos and Rashi more plausible: "bake and seethe both omers together for to-day and to-morrow"; for if so, it would not be in any way remarkable or miraculous, that the manna did, on Sabbath, not go over into putrefaction (ver. 24).—About the different methods how the manna was cooked, see Rosenmüller on this verse.—אֵפוּ instead of אֱפוּ; the chateph is, at the beginning of words, changed into a zere, not only in *verbs* primae gutturalis, as אֵתָיוּ (Isaiah xxi. 12, instead of אֱתָיוּ), אֵרוֹמָם (Isaiah xxxiii. 10, instead of אֱרוֹמָם), etc.; but also in substantives, beginning with א, as אֵמוּן (instead of אֱמוּן, compare plural אֱמוּנִים), אֵפוֹד, אֵבוּס, etc.

26. לא יהיה־בו, namely, המן. Here the law of Sabbath concerning the manna is generalized.

27. The preposition מן in יצאו מן העם, is here used in its original partitive meaning, *some* of the people went out, as in xvii. 5: מזקני "some of the elders"; and in vi. 25: *one* is to be supplied: מבנות פוטיאל, *one* of the daughters of Putiel, which case is, however, not very frequent.

28. Moses is addressed instead, and in the name of the whole people; and the rebuke here expressed by God does not apply to him personally.

29. God shows in a most obvious manner His wish to see the Sabbath consecrated, by His sending double food on the sixth day.—*Abide you every man in his place*, that is, do not go out with the intention to gather manna; this literal meaning has already been adopted by Rashi. But rabbinical tradition has, from these words, deduced the prohibition, that no Israelite shall go farther than 2000 yards, that is 6 stadia, or 750 Roman paces, from the place of his abode (תחום שבת, σαββάτου ὁδός, "the Sabbath-way," Acts i. 12); for that was the distance of the holy tabernacle from the remotest part of the Hebrew camp (*Talm.* Erubim, cap. 5).—Although the law about the Sabbath-way is not distinctly stated in the legislation, it is certainly in accordance with the spirit and character of the Sabbath. Travelling interrupts the rest both of the men and the beasts, and was therefore to be avoided (*Joseph.*, Antiq. XIII. viii. 4). From the same reasons unnecessary military marches were interdicted on Sabbath (see on xx. 8—11). However, prome-

Lord hath said, To-morrow is [1]a day of rest, a holy rest
to the Lord: bake *that* which you will bake *to-day*, and
seethe that which you will seethe; and that which remaineth
over lay up for you to be kept until the morning.
24. And they laid it up till the morning, as Moses commanded: and it did not smell offensively, nor was there
any worm therein. 25. And Moses said, Eat that to-day;
for to-day *is* a Sabbath to the Lord: to-day you will not
find it in the field. 26. Six days you shall gather it; but
on the seventh day, *which is* the Sabbath, in it there shall
be none.—27. And it came to pass, *that* there went out
some of the people on the seventh day to gather, and they
found none. 28. And the Lord said to Moses, How long
do you refuse to keep my commandments and my laws?
29. See, that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath;
therefore He giveth you on the sixth day the bread of
two days; abide you every man in his place, let no man go
out of his place on the seventh day. 30. So the people
rested on the seventh day. 31. And the house of Israel
called the name thereof Manna: and it *was* like coriander
seed, white; and the taste of it *was* like [2]cake *made* with

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—The rest of the holy Sabbath unto. [2] Wafers.

nading for the sake of recreation, and, even distant, visits to prophets or other public teachers and houses of divine worship, seem not to have been forbidden; and even riding was, for the latter purpose, not unusual (see 2 Kings iv. 23. Compare *Lightfoot*, Hor. Hebr. p. 904; *Selden*, Just. Nat. et Gent. iii. 9, p. 317; Eshkol Hakofer, § 144; Cusari iii. 35; *Michaelis*, Mos. R. iv. 124).—About שבו תחתיו see to x. 23, ad קמו מתחתיו.

30. The people followed the divine injunction concerning the Sabbath, and nobody went out to seek manna.

31. The manna is compared with זרע גד לבן. With the only exception of the Samaritan codex, which takes גד as oryza decorticata, all the interpreters understand it as *coriander*; thus, for instance, Jonathan, כוסבר or כסבר; the Septuagint, *σπέρμα κορίου* (under which name coriander is mentioned by Theophrastus and Dioscorides); Vulg., semen coriandri; Luther, etc.; and according to an old authority, coriander was by the Africans (Carthagenians) called *γοίδ* (=גד). The *coriandrum sativum* is frequently found in Egypt, Persia and India (*Plin.*, Hist. Nat. xx. 82), has a round, tall stalk, the lower leaves are simply feathered, and toothed; the upper ones are smaller, doubly feathered, and pointed; it bears umbelliferous white or reddish flowers, from which arise globular greyish-coloured, spicy, hollow seed-corns, the surface marked with fine striae; they are in Egypt exclusively employed as a spice in meat and other food (compare *Prosp. Alp.*, De Plant. Ægypt. c. xlii., p. 61). It is, at present, also much cultivated in the south of Europe, and in this country, as its seeds

כְּזֶרַע גַּד לָבָן וְטַעְמוֹ כְּצַפִּיחִת בִּדְבָשׁ׃ 32 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה זֶה
הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה מְלֹא הָעֹמֶר מִמֶּנּוּ לְמִשְׁמֶרֶת לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם
לְמַעַן ׀ יִרְאוּ אֶת־הַלֶּחֶם אֲשֶׁר הֶאֱכַלְתִּי אֶתְכֶם בַּמִּדְבָּר בְּהוֹצִיאִי
אֶתְכֶם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 33 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־אַהֲרֹן קַח צִנְצֶנֶת
אַחַת וְתֶן־שָׁמָּה מְלֹא־הָעֹמֶר מָן וְהַנַּח אֹתוֹ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה לְמִשְׁמֶרֶת
לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם׃ 34 כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וַיַּנִּיחֵהוּ אַהֲרֹן לִפְנֵי
הָעֵדֻת לְמִשְׁמָרֶת׃ 35 וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אָכְלוּ אֶת־הַמָּן אַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה

are used by confectioners and druggists, and its leaves are employed as an ingredient for different kinds of dishes. As, therefore, the coriander is yellowish, Rashi explains our words thus: "The manna was, with regard to the globular form, similar to the seeds of coriander, which has besides, a white colour." And similarly Kimchi: "The manna was white, and consisted of grains like those of coriander-seed." But these explanations are against the construction of the words; and לבן is not exactly white, but whitish, which colour may fall into yellow. In Num. xi. 7, the colour is described as that of ברלח, or bdellium, which is "whitish, resinous, and pellucid, nearly the colour of frankincense; when broken it appears the colour of wax."—Its taste was כצפיחת *like honey-cake* (properly, from צפח, to be broad). Sept. ὡς ἐγκρὶς ἐν μέλιτι; Saadiah, רקק, "thin cake"; Onkelos, אסקריטון (ἐσχαρίτης), "bread baked on a gridiron."—According to Num. xi. 8, the taste of manna resembled that of "an *oiled* cake" (לשד השמן, Septuagint, ἐγκρὶς ἐξ ἐλαίου); which Ebn Ezra, Rashbam, and others, reconcile by the supposition, that the manna, when falling from the air, tasted like coriander, but, when ground and cooked, like oil. However, coriander and oil are both poetical figures for a soft agreeable substance. According to the Rabbins (compare also the Wisd. of Sal. xvi. 20), the manna contained ingredients of every delicious food, and had a different taste for the children, the youths, the men, and the aged, to every one according to his individual liking.

32—34. An omer of the manna was to be preserved, that the future generations might be reminded with what miraculous food God supported the Israelites in the desert—a proof that, according to the narrative of the sacred text, not the usual manna which falls every year, and which was known to everybody, is here understood. That omer was likewise intended or calculated to recall, in times of disbelief and misery, to the memory of the Israelites, God's providence and love, by exhibiting the unsubstantial food with which He satisfied so many millions through so protracted a period.—It was to be preserved in a צנצנת, which word occurs in this passage only. The ancient translators render it with the general term, vessel (so the Septuagint, στάμνος; Vulgate, "vas;" Onkelos, צלוחית; and similarly the Syriac Version, Saadiah and Ebn Ezra), qualifying it either as a vessel of clay or of gold. But the etymology leads us more distinctly to the root צנן, to braid or plait, so that צנצנת would be a vessel of wicker-work, *a basket*, and would coincide with טנא, Chald. צנא, basket, and so explains Parchon, צנות, in Am. iv. 2, by סלים. It is cognate with צִנָּה, shield, because shields also were originally plaited of wicker-work.—This vessel with manna was to be placed לפני יי׳, or לפני העדת, before God, or before the Testimony, which two expressions must, therefore, be identical; עדת stands here instead of ארון העדות (xxv. 21, 22), the "ark of the covenant," which contained the two stone tablets upon which the ten commandments were en-

honey.—32. And Moses said, This *is* the thing which the Lord commandeth: Fill an omer of it to be kept for your generations; that they may see the bread which I have given you in the wilderness, when I brought you forth from the land of Egypt. 33. And Moses said to Aaron, Take a vessel, and put an omer full of manna therein, and lay it up before the Lord, to be kept for your generations. 34. As the Lord commanded Moses, so Aaron laid it up before the testimony, to be kept. 35. And the children of Israel did eat manna forty years, until they came to [1]the land which they were to inhabit; they did eat the

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—A land inhabited.

graved. The vessel with the manna, occupied thus a most significant place in the holy tabernacle. It is self-evident, from this circumstance, that this command, or at least its execution (ver. 34), cannot fall into the time of our chapter, namely, the second month after the exode, but considerably later, after the legislation, and the construction and erection of the tabernacle. But the historian intended to combine, in these verses, all notices relating to the manna, and, from the same consideration, the next verse (ver. 35) contains even the fact, that the Israelites were provided with manna during forty years, till they came to the borders of the promised land. Instances of a similar anticipation occur both in the Pentateuch and the historical books of the Old Testament (compare Gen. xxv. 8; 1 Sam. xvii. 54, etc.). According to Joshua v. 10—12, the manna ceased after the transit of the Israelites over the Jordan, *after the death of Moses*, who could, therefore, have made that statement only, מפי הגבורה, by divine inspiration (as *Abarbanel* observes), especially as Moses knew, according to Numb. xiv. 33, that the Israelites would eat the manna for forty years. According to others, this remark has been inserted by Joshua, or by Moses, immediately before his demise. Hengstenberg explains, that our verse simply relates that the Israelites were provided with manna till they came to the inhabited districts in the *east* of the Jordan, without leading the narrative beyond the time of Moses; they eat manna till that period, which does not exclude their enjoying the same heavenly food even after that time (Auth. ii. 210; compare i. 67). A similar difficulty and difference of opinion prevails in Deut. xxxiv. 5. *et seq.* where the death of Moses himself is reported.—Forty years are given as a round sum, although the manna lasted about one month less; for it commenced in the second month after the exode (ver. 1), and ceased immediately after the first Passover which the Israelites celebrated in the west of the Jordan (Josh. v. 12).—אל ארץ נושבת. The Septuagint, Vulgate, English Version, and many modern commentators, translate: "until they came *to a land inhabited*." This is at variance both with history—for the Israelites passed, long before their entrance into Canaan, through many inhabited countries, for instance, those of Sihon and Og—and with the succeeding words, which are explanatory of that statement: "until they came to the borders of the land of Canaan" (to Gilgal). The Part. נושבת, admits, very unforcedly, the translation: "until they came into the land *which was to be inhabited* by them;" for the Hebrew participle may be used for all tenses, past, present and future, and corresponds very frequently with the Latin participle in *dus*; for instance,

עַד־בֹּאָם אֶל־אֶרֶץ נוֹשָׁבֶת אֶת־הַמָּן אָכְלוּ עַד־בֹּאָם אֶל־קְצֵה אֶרֶץ
כְּנָעַן׃ 36 וְהָעֹמֶר עֲשִׂרִית הָאֵיפָה הוּא׃ פ שביעי

מְהֻלָּל (Ps. xviii. 4), laudandus, to be praised, praiseworthy; so that ארץ נושבת, signifies: "terra ipsis incolenda." Similarly translate Luther (Zu dem Lande, da sie wohnen sollten); further De Wette, Maurer, and others.

36. ***Now an omer is the tenth part of an ephah.*** The Septuagint translates: *Τὸ δὲ γομὸρ τὸ δέκατον τῶν τριῶν μέτρων ἦν*: "The omer was the tenth part of three *measures*" (that is, seahs, $\frac{3}{10}$). Thus also Onkelos and Rashi: The omer was the third part of three סאה. Rashi continues, One *seah* (סאה) is equal to 6 *kabs* (קב), one *kab* is equal to 4 *logs* (לוג), and one *log* is equal to 6 *eggs*, so that, again, an *omer* is equal to 43⅕ *eggs* (for, if a *log* is equal to 6 *eggs*, a *kab* is equal to 24, and a *seah* is equal to 144; therefore, three *seahs* are equal to 432, and the tenth part, or an *omer*, is equal to 43⅕). See note on ver. 16. The Septuagint usually renders איפה by the Egyptian word *οἰφί* or *οἰφεί*, that is, measure; and הין it translates with *εἶν* or *ἶν*, that is, *ἶνιον*, which is the Egyptian name for sextarius. Ephah and hin seem therefore to have been originally Egyptian measures. (Compare *Böckh*, Metrol. Unters. p. 244; De *Wette*, Arch. § 183, note *a*). The molten sea of Solomon (1 Kings vii. 23—26) contained two thousand baths; and if we compare the dimensions of this vessel (which was ten cubits in diameter, five cubits high, and in circumference thirty cubits), and if we take the cubit at fifteen inches, the "sea" contained, according to Saalschütz (Mos. R. i. p. 194—199), 1,325,358 cubic inches; and each bath or ephah was, therefore, 662⅔ cubic inches (or about 10½ quarts), and the omer about one quart. We shall, in due place, examine this computation.—Omer, עמר, properly sheaf, was, probably, the measure which was filled by the grains of one sheaf. But, as sheaves are of uncertain size, it is impossible to base any conjecture upon that derivation. The Mosaic

יז 1 וַיִּסְעוּ כָּל־עֲדַת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּדְבַּר־סִין לְמַסְעֵיהֶם עַל־פִּי

CHAPTER XVII.

SUMMARY.—From Sin (Wadi esh-Sheikh) the Israelites journey on in a southern direction, till they come to Rephidim, in the vicinity of Horeb (see on ver. 1). Oppressed by want of water, the Israeltites mumur against Moses, again reproaching him, to have led them rashly from their safe abodes in Egypt. But God quiets their discontent by miraculously producing abundant supplies of water from a rock in Horeb.—In Rephidim the Israelites are, for the first time, inimically encountered by any of the heathen nations; they are attacked by the Amalekites. Joshua is appointed by Moses as general; Moses himself, accompanied by Aaron and Hur, stand during the battle, visible to all, on a hill near Horeb, and after a hot combat, which protracted itself till sunset, the Amalekites were defeated.—Moses is charged by God, to write the history of this memorable event into his book, which was then already commenced. Moses erects, in commemoration, an altar, which he calls, "God is my banner!" The extirpation of Amalek from among the nations of the earth is decreed in the council of God.

1. The Israelites break up from Sin which we have found identical with Wadi esh-Sheikh (see on xvi. 1); and from here they proceed on the command of God (על פי י״י) always nearer to their first great aim, the Sinai, and arrive at Dophkah, then at Alush (Num. xxxiii. 12, 13), and lastly at Rephidim. The two first stations are here omitted from the same principle, which we have already pointed out in our note on xvi. 1; and the text pauses at Rephidim, where the people "tried God" once more (ver. 2).—From the whole context (compare xviii. 5),

manna until they came to the borders of the land of Canaan. 36. Now an omer *is* the tenth *part* of an ephah.

law supposes the case that sheaves might be overlooked, and left in the field; for they were considerably smaller than they are in our countries, the corn being cut merely with the sickle.—Some critics have found, in the accuracy with which our text describes the quantity of the omer, a proof, that this verse cannot have been written in the time of Moses, when all those measures were so universally known. But laws are necessarily more explicit than a simple narrative; and, in order to secure uniformity and stability for the future, a clear statement was very desirable. And, in general, accuracy in detail, especially of measures, which is a characteristic of almost all ancient writers, cannot possibly be taken as an argument against the authenticity of a passage.—Michælis (Suppl. p. 1929), Kanne (ii. p. 77), and Hengstenberg (Authent. ii. p. 212, 213), are of opinion that omer is no name of a measure, but a kind of vessel or jar, which everybody carried with him, and which might therefore be used as a measure. But, granted even, that every Israelite was provided with such a utensil, it is difficult to suppose, that they were all of precisely the same size, and therefore fit to serve as a measure. Neither the analogy of the Arabic غمر, which Michælis urges, nor the circumstance that the Pentateuch very frequently uses עשירית האפה or עשרון instead of omer (Hengstenberg), is conclusive. Notwithstanding the existence of the *crown*, as a current English coin, it is, in the common intercourse, less used than its value, *five shillings*.—The history of the manna has given rise to numerous, often very ingenious, typical and allegorical explanations, about which see *Buxtorf, fil.*, Historia Mannæ, in his Exercitt. ad Histor. Arcæ Fœderis, p. 336, *et seq.* Compare, however, note on ver. 4, p. 291.

CHAP. XVII. 1. And all the congregation of the children of Israel journeyed from the wilderness of Sin, after their journeys, according to the commandment of the Lord, and encamped in Rephidim: and *there was* no water

especially from ver. 6, where the "rock in Horeb" is mentioned, Rephidim cannot lie far from the group of the Horeb mountains. The more accurate situation cannot be fixed with certainty. Perhaps it is the plain of Szueir, which is open and covered with low hills, and which extends between the Wadi esh-Sheikh and the Horeb in a southerly direction. But the Wadi Feiran it cannot possibly be, as Kutscheit and others believe, as that valley lies at too great a distance northwest of Horeb (see on xvi. 1).—Kitto infers, from the statement of Makrizi: "that Feiran was one of the towns of the Amalekites," that Rephidim is the Wadi Feiran. But according to ver. 8, the Amalekites *proceed* to Rephidim to fight against Israel (see on ver. 8).—According to others it is the deep, dark, rocky valley El-Ledsha, between the Horeb and the Mount St. Catherine, and in the west of the former (see p. 63); but this would, on the other hand, be so near the mountain of legislation, that another day's journey into the "desert of Sinai," would have been superfluous or impossible (see on xix. 1, 2).—The Israelites proceeded למסעיהם, *after their journeys*, in which word Ebn Ezra finds the allusion, that here the two above-mentioned stations are omitted, as if it signified: "in the course of their journeys." But this meaning of למסעיהם would in the rarest

יְהוָה וַיַּחֲנוּ בִּרְפִידִים וְאֵין מַיִם לִשְׁתֹּת הָעָם׃ 2 וַיָּרֶב הָעָם עִם־
מֹשֶׁה וַיֹּאמְרוּ תְּנוּ־לָנוּ מַיִם וְנִשְׁתֶּה וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם מֹשֶׁה מַה־תְּרִיבוּן
עִמָּדִי מַה־תְּנַסּוּן אֶת־יְהוָה׃ 3 וַיִּצְמָא שָׁם הָעָם לַמַּיִם וַיָּלֶן הָעָם
עַל־מֹשֶׁה וַיֹּאמֶר לָמָּה זֶּה הֶעֱלִיתָנוּ מִמִּצְרַיִם לְהָמִית אֹתִי וְאֶת־
בָּנַי וְאֶת־מִקְנַי בַּצָּמָא׃ 4 וַיִּצְעַק מֹשֶׁה אֶל־יְהוָה לֵאמֹר מָה
אֶעֱשֶׂה לָעָם הַזֶּה עוֹד מְעַט וּסְקָלֻנִי׃ 5 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה
עֲבֹר לִפְנֵי הָעָם וְקַח אִתְּךָ מִזִּקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּמַטְּךָ אֲשֶׁר הִכִּיתָ בּוֹ
אֶת־הַיְאֹר קַח בְּיָדְךָ וְהָלָכְתָּ׃ 6 הִנְנִי עֹמֵד לְפָנֶיךָ שָּׁם ׀ עַל־הַצּוּר

cases meet the sense.—*And there was no water for the people to drink.* The construction לשתת העם is irregular, instead of לעם, from which reason Mendelssohn takes לשתת as a substantive: "there was no water for the drinking of the people"; and compares therewith Gen. xvi. 9: "After ten years לשבת אברהם, from the sojourning of Abraham." The great scarcity of water in the peninsula of Sinai is universally known: "In a space of 315 miles," says Harmar, "over part of this wilderness, Mr. Irwin found only four springs of water. In another space of 115 miles he found only four springs, at one of which the water was brackish, and at the other unwholesome." See xv. 22, 23; compare *Tacit.*, Hist. v. 3.

2. *And the people quarrelled with Moses and said* תנו לנו מים, *give us water.* The plural תנו comprises Moses and Aaron; for the latter was the speaker through whom Moses addressed the Israelites. All the great and various wonders, which the Lord had hitherto wrought against their adversaries and for their own subsistence, had yet little served to strengthen their reliance in the love, and their belief in the omnipotence of God, and at every new privation, or every approaching danger, they murmured with obstinacy and refractoriness against Moses, who as they now knew, was but the instrument and messenger of God. But God's long-suffering and love in the face of this disbelief and contumacy, proved inexhaustible. On this occasion also the Israelites had, at a momentary want of water, impetuously demanded the satisfaction of that want, exclaiming: "we will try the Lord, and see whether He is really among us or not" (ver. 7). But this was a direct and immediate temptation of God, for which Moses reproved them with the words: "Wherefore do you try the Lord"? (ver. 2). To lead such a people into the land of promise, and to give them a pure and sublime, but still to them comprehensible religion and legislation, was a work, which human power alone would have been incapable to execute.

3. As the Israelites reproached Moses in xvi. 3, when famine menaced, that he had torn them from their Egyptian tranquillity and comfort, so also here, when the horrors of thirst threatened them. So deeply were their souls degraded, that they did not feel the ignominious servitude in Egypt, and even longingly remembered the "onions and garlick," which they did eat there freely.— The singular of the suffixes in אתי, בני, and מקני refers to the collective noun עָם, which is in the singular.

4. Moses cried to God: What shall I do to this people? *there is but little wanting, and they will stone me* (עוד מעט וסקלני). Thus the Sept., (*ἔτι μικρόν, καὶ καταλιθοβολήσουσί με*), and Vulgate; that is, their dissatisfaction has reached such a degree, that they will

for the people to drink. 2. And the people quarrelled with Moses, and said, Give us water, that we may drink. And Moses said to them, Why do you quarrel with me? Wherefore do you try the Lord? 3. And the people thirsted there for water; and the people murmured against Moses, and said, Wherefore *is* this *that* thou hast brought us up out of Egypt to kill us and our children and our cattle with thirst? 4. And Moses cried to the Lord, saying, What shall I do to this people? [1]There is but little *wanting*, and they will stone me. 5. And the Lord said to Moses, Go on before the people, and take with thee of the elders of Israel; and thy staff, wherewith thou smotest the river, take in thy hand, and go. 6. Behold, I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb;

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—They be almost ready to stone me.

almost kill me in their excitement. Rashi takes the words עוד מעט less appropriately in their proper sense: "if I wait but a little, they will stone me."—The construction עוד מעט וסקלני is similar to that of ערב וידעתם and בקר וראיתם, xvi. 6, 7, which see.

5. God said to Moses: *Go on before the people.* Some, as Abarbanel, refer these words to the preceding verse: thou art afraid, the people might stone thee; now, stand before it, and thou wilt see that it will not touch thee. But more correctly that phrase finds its explanation in the following verse: Go thou first alone to Horeb, whilst the people shall still remain in Rephidim.—Moses shall take some of the elders with him, according to Rashi and others, "that they might see and bear witness, that through him the water came from the rock, lest anybody say, that already from ancient times fountains existed there."—About מן in מזקני, see on xvi. 27.—According to Nachmanides, the staff of Moses is here designedly described as that with which the Nile was smitten (vii. 20; viii. 5, etc.), not as that, which was converted into a serpent, or in any similar manner, because in both cases a miracle was to be effected *with the water.*

6. This verse narrates a new wonder, how Moses, before the eyes of the elders, and by the assistance of God, struck water from a rock on Horeb, so that the whole people of Israel and all their flocks and herds had sufficient to drink. Our text admits no doubt concerning the miracle itself, and the manner in which it was effected; but tradition, mostly embellished by Christian monks and Mohammedan pilgrims, has appropriated to itself this subject to adorn and to hand down even its minutest details, with no word alluded to in the holy record, to the pious believers; and even enlightened travellers have suffered themselves to be blinded by such intentional or pious fictions. Thus reports Shaw, that, after having descended, with considerable difficulty, on the western side of Mount Sinai, he arrived in the plain of Rephidim [see, however, on ver. 1]. Here he saw that ancient relic, the rock *Meriba*, which he believes has remained to his time without the least change. He describes it as a square granite rock, each side about six yards long, which lies moveable and loose in the midst of the valley; it appears formerly to have been a piece or cliff of Mount Sinai, from which a great number of such huge rocks hang over the plain. The

בְּחֹרֵב וְהִכִּיתָ בַצּוּר וְיָצְאוּ מִמֶּנּוּ מַיִם וְשָׁתָה הָעָם וַיַּעַשׂ כֵּן מֹשֶׁה
לְעֵינֵי זִקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ 7 וַיִּקְרָא שֵׁם הַמָּקוֹם מַסָּה וּמְרִיבָה
עַל־רִיב ׀ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְעַל נַסֹּתָם אֶת־יְהוָה לֵאמֹר הֲיֵשׁ יְהוָה
בְּקִרְבֵּנוּ אִם־אָיִן׃ פ
8 וַיָּבֹא עֲמָלֵק וַיִּלָּחֶם עִם־יִשְׂרָאֵל בִּרְפִידִם׃ 9 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ

water which streamed from it has hollowed out a canal, about two inches deep and twenty wide, which is entirely covered with a kind of crust. Besides some spots overgrown with moss, which is still preserved by the dew, a number of holes are visible, some of which are four or five inches deep, and one or two in diameter, and Shaw considers them as clear and convincing traces that they were, formerly, as many fountains, and the effects of a great and extraordinary miracle. Similar accounts are given by Pococke (Description of the Orient, i. p. 215), who remarks, among other circumstances, that the rock has, on each side, twelve apertures, some of which have the appearance of lions' mouths. Instead of every other opinion or judgment, we subjoin the following intelligent observation of Mosheim (Preface to the German translation of Pococke's Orient, p. xvi): "We know the monks of Mount Sinai long since as men of no such sensitive conscience as to shrink from inventing wonders, and deceiving the travellers by fictitious monuments of the old and true miracles. It is not at all impossible, that those good people, in order to allure a greater number of pilgrims, and to enrich their convent, have hewn all those holes into the rock. And who knows whether the European divines have not, in the time of the crusades, improved that master-piece? We could collect a pretty numerous list of such pious impositions devised and executed during the period of the crusades. However, I will not decide in this matter. The green moss round the holes, and on that part of the rock over which the water has passed, seems to support the opinion of those who consider these apertures as eternal witnesses of the divine miracle; but the lion-like shape of some of these holes, which Pococke has observed, the order in which they stand, the number of the openings, which is the same on both sides, and which coincides with the number of the tribes of Israel, the exactly identical size of the holes, these, and several other circumstances, render the matter suspected in my eyes, almost against my will." Similar opinions of Büshing, Breuning, Belon, and others, see in *Rosenmüller's* Orient, ii. pp. 48—50. We have only introduced these remarks to prove how fluctuating and precarious the traditions are, which the mere desire of multiplying the wonders has invented, and which find no basis or justification in the holy text. —The knowledge of that miracle has reached other nations also, although in a disfigured form; thus relates Tacitus (Hist. v. 3): "But nothing distressed them so much as the want of water. And they were already all lying, throughout the whole camp, almost ready to expire, when a herd of wild asses, returning from pasture, approached a rock, shaded with a grove. Moses followed them, conjecturing that he would find a fertile soil, and opened large springs of water." For other passages, in which we can, however, find no clear allusion to the event of our text, see *Huetius*, Quæst. Lib. ii. cap. 12, § 13; compare, however, *Pausan.* IV.xxxvi. 5.—Nachmanides connects the beginning of our verse with the end of the preceding one, in the following manner: "Go, and proceed so long till thou perceivest me stand before thee on a rock." As regards the *sense*, a similar connection certainly exists between both

and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink. And Moses did so in the sight of the elders of Israel. 7. And he called the name of the place Massah, and Meribah, because of the quarrelling of the children of Israel, and because they tried the Lord, saying, Is the Lord among us, or not?

8. Then came Amalek, and fought with Israel in Rephidim.
9. And Moses said to Joshua, Choose out for us men, and

verses.—On the geographical position of Horeb and Sinai, and the abundance of fountains and pastures there, see pp. 62—64.—The words: "Behold, I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb," are thus explained by Ebn Ezra: "My strength and my power are in Horeb;" in which again a tendency to a figurative or rational interpretation is visible. From the article in הצור, Abarbanel concludes, that here a rock is designated which was already known to Moses, and upon which God had already appeared to him; compare xxxiii. 22. However, the article is, in הצור, similarly used as in הבאר, in ii. 15, which see.

7. The name of the place where our occurrence took place was called מסה (trial), because the Israelites had there tried God (see on ver. 2), and מריבה (quarrel), because they murmured against Moses, that he had led them from Egypt.

8. *Then came Amalek, and fought with Israel in Rephidim.* With this event begins a new epoch in the historical existence of the people of Israel. Till then God had, as it were, Himself combatted for Israel, whilst they observed a quiet passive attitude (see xiv. 14). But now, in their struggle with Amalek, the Hebrews were, for the first time, to oppose the enemy with their own power and valour, and, though lovingly supported by divine assistance, to conquer by human means. The circumstance, that the Amalekites were the first who assumed a hostile position against the Israelites in their wanderings, caused a deadly indelible hatred between both nations, which was, on the part of the latter, the more intense and burning, as they had even not yet touched the proper territory of the Amalekites, who (as the Midrash correctly deduces from ויבא, in our verse) marched to Rephidim to attack the Israelites, without cause or necessity, just as, at all times, wild and warlike tribes of the desert fall upon and plunder the peaceful caravans. It appears further, from Deut. xxv. 17, 18, that they insidiously attacked the rear of the Hebrew army, when it was exhausted and weary. The Amalekites are, according to Gen. xxxvi. 12, 16, of Idumæan origin, descending from Amalek, grandson of Esau. If we combine the different statements of the Old Testament concerning them, we find, that their abodes were in the south of Palestine, in Arabia Petræa, in the neighbourhood of the Philistines, of the Mount Seir, and the town Shur (Pelusium); therefore the principal part of the Amalekites seems to have lived between Philistia, Egypt, Edom, and the desert of Mount Sinai, although a part of them inhabited the mountains of Ephraim (Judges v. 14). According to Arabian writers, as Abulfeda, the Amalekites were a very ancient indigenous people of Arabia, which is said to have lived there prior to the Ishmaelites, and even to the Joktanites. They assert also, that the Canaanites emigrated from Arabia to Palestine, and call them Amalekites. These accounts have a doubtful historical value, and they do not justify us in considering the Canaanites and the Amalekites as two nations *of the same* tribe or stock. Compare *Vater*, Pent. i. 140; *Reland*, Palest. p. 78, *seq.*; *Mannert*, vi. 1.

בְּחַר־לָנוּ אֲנָשִׁים וְצֵא הִלָּחֵם בַּעֲמָלֵק מָחָר אָנֹכִי נִצָּב עַל־רֹאשׁ
הַגִּבְעָה וּמַטֵּה הָאֱלֹהִים בְּיָדִי׃ 10 וַיַּעַשׂ יְהוֹשֻׁעַ כַּאֲשֶׁר אָמַר־לוֹ
מֹשֶׁה לְהִלָּחֵם בַּעֲמָלֵק וּמֹשֶׁה אַהֲרֹן וְחוּר עָלוּ רֹאשׁ הַגִּבְעָה׃
11 וְהָיָה כַּאֲשֶׁר יָרִים מֹשֶׁה יָדוֹ וְגָבַר יִשְׂרָאֵל וְכַאֲשֶׁר יָנִיחַ יָדוֹ
וְגָבַר עֲמָלֵק׃ 12 וִידֵי מֹשֶׁה כְּבֵדִים וַיִּקְחוּ־אֶבֶן וַיָּשִׂימוּ תַחְתָּיו
וַיֵּשֶׁב עָלֶיהָ וְאַהֲרֹן וְחוּר תָּמְכוּ בְיָדָיו מִזֶּה אֶחָד וּמִזֶּה אֶחָד וַיְהִי

183, *et seq.* The historical relations between Amalek and Israel are easily traceable. After the Amalekites had been defeated in this first contact with the Hebrews at Rephidim, they conquered, later, the wandering Israelites at the southern frontier of Canaan (Numbers xiv. 43, *et seq.*) This called forth such animosity, that a perfect and eternal extirpation of the hateful tribe was severely commanded by the legislator (Deut. xxv. 17—19). In the period of the Judges, hordes of the Amalekites joined the enemies of the Israelites (1 Sam. xiv. 48, etc). Saul and David defeated them several times (1 Sam. xiv. 48; xv.; xxvii. 8; xxx. 1, *et seq.*; 2 Sam. viii. 12); and their last remains were destroyed by the Simeonites, under Hezekiah (1 Chron. iv. 43). From this time they are no more mentioned in the Biblical history.

9. Moses orders Joshua (יהושע) to choose men for the combat against the Amalekites. Joshua, who became afterwards so important in the history of Israel, is here mentioned for the first time. He was the son of Nun, from the tribe of Ephraim, and his name was originally הושע, which was changed into יהושע, when Moses sent him with Caleb to explore Canaan (Numb. xiii. 16). But he is, by anticipation, called by the latter name already in our passage; in xxiv. 13; xxxiii. 11, etc. Compare also *Hengstenberg*, Authent. ii. 395, 396; *Ewald*, Hist. ii. 233 *et seq.* In all undertakings he distinguished himself so much by courage and intelligence, that Moses chose him for his nearest and most familiar servant and companion; and, before his death, appointed him as the chief general of the Israelites (Exod. xxiv. 13; xxxii. 17; Numb. xi. 28; xiv. 6). He and Caleb were the only persons who, although above twenty years at the departure from Egypt, reached the Holy Land. As he attained the age of one hundred and ten years, and lived forty years in the desert, and twenty-five years in Canaan, he was, at the time of the war with Amalek, forty-five years old. Joshua was to fight with his chosen warriors (אנשים; Rashi גבורים) against Amalek, whilst Moses stood, during the combat, with his staff in his hand, "on the top of the hill," not exactly on Mount Sinai, as Ebn Ezra adds.

10. Moses proceeded there, accompanied by Aaron and Hur (חור). The latter is, according to the Talmud (Sotah, 11 *b.*), the *son* of Miriam and Caleb (and grandfather of Bezaleel, xxxi. 2), but, according to Josephus (Antiq. III. ii. 4), the *husband* of Miriam (see Shemoth Rabbah, cap. 41, 42, 48).

11. The sense of this verse is obscure, and has already much engaged the ancient interpreters, who attributed to it a symbolical meaning. Thus we read in the Talmud (Rosh. Hash. fol. 29): "Can really the hands of Moses cause victory, if they are raised, or defeat, if they are let down? But Holy Writ teaches us here, that, when the Israelites looked up to heaven, and humbled themselves before their heavenly father, they were victorious; if not, they were defeated. This is similar to the precept in Num. xxi. 8: 'Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole: and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when

go out, fight with Amalek: to-morrow I will stand on the top of the hill with the staff of God in my hand. 10. So Joshua did as Moses had said to him, [1]to fight with Amalek: and Moses, Aaron, and Hur went up to the top of the hill. 11. And it came to pass, when Moses held up his hand, that Israel prevailed: and when he let down his hand, Amalek prevailed. 12. But Moses' hands *were* heavy; and they took a stone, and put *it* under him, and he sat thereon; and Aaron and Hur supported his hands, the one on the one side, and the other on the other side;

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—And fought.

he looketh upon it, shall live.' Can a serpent cause or prevent healing? But if the Israelites regarded the heaven and were obedient to the precepts of their God, they were healed; if not, they perished."—This interpretation, although it approaches the spirit of our narrative, is yet too general to apply to this event. For during the combat, piety or impiety were out of the question; and further, the text does not state that the Israelites looked sometimes up to the hand of Moses and sometimes not; but that Moses now raised and now lowered it. Further, the *staff* of Moses would be of no meaning in that interpretation. The same must be objected to the explanation of Targum Jonathan and Jerusalem, that when Moses raised his hands to pray for the Israelites, they were victorious. Many interpreters have, therefore, proposed the explanation, that Moses raised his staff like a banner (נס), and when the Israelites saw this banner, they were courageous and victorious; if they did not see it, they were desponding and fled; and therefore the place was called יי׳ נסי, "The Lord is my banner" (ver. 15). Thus, "to raise the hand" would be identical with "to show and display the standard." Joshua and Caleb, they continue, accompanied Moses, to bring his military commands to the army. Now, when Moses let the staff sink, the Israelites thought that he wished them to desist from the combat, and they became thus more languid in their exertions.—This explanation recommends itself from more than one side; and if a plain and natural interpretation is admissible in a passage, which seems to be designedly mysterious, it is no doubt the most acceptable. But questionable is the opinion of those who suppose that this whole account has been composed after a picture, in which Moses was represented as general with his hand raised to heaven.

12. *And Moses' hands were heavy* (כבדים); they became naturally tired after having been held up for any length of time. Aaron and Hur support his hands, one at each side; and they assist *alternately* that hand of Moses, with which he happened to raise the staff.—*And his hands were steady*, that is, he could lift them up without feeling fatigue. Rashi explains: "his hands were stretched out in confidence and belief, and with a devout and earnest prayer;" Rashbam: "his hands were firm for all times;" both against the context, which Ebn Ezra has indubitably explained correctly: "his hands stood firm." The dual ידיו is construed with the singular of the verb ויהי, which is frequently the case, especially if the verb precedes; see on iv. 29. Ebn Ezra explains the singular ויהי by interpreting ידיו "either of his hands." That Hebrew idiom may, indeed, originally have been the result of a similar consideration. The substantive אמונה, firmness, here the predicate, is used quite in the signification of an ad-

יָדָיו אֱמוּנָה עַד־בֹּא הַשָּׁמֶשׁ׃ 13 וַיַּחֲלֹשׁ יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת־עֲמָלֵק וְאֶת־
עַמּוֹ לְפִי־חָרֶב׃ פ מפטיר
14 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה כְּתֹב זֹאת זִכָּרוֹן בַּסֵּפֶר וְשִׂים בְּאָזְנֵי
יְהוֹשֻׁעַ כִּי־מָחֹה אֶמְחֶה אֶת־זֵכֶר עֲמָלֵק מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמָיִם׃ 15 וַיִּבֶן

jective; firm, steady, as is the case in many other instances; for the Hebrew language, which is distinguished by a remarkable want of adjectives, replaces that deficiency in several ways; see Lev. xxi. 6, והיו קדש, "They shall be holy," properly, holiness; Ps. xxxv. 6, יהי דרכם חשך, "Their way shall be dark," properly, darkness; compare Ps. xix. 10, Ezek. xli. 22; and note on iv. 10.

13. חלש, originally to be weak, Job xiv. 10, here transitive, to weaken, to vanquish. את עמלק ואת עמו *Amalek and his people*, is, as Rosenmüller observes, a Hendiadys, instead of "the people of the Amalekites;" for the *king* cannot be understood by Amalek, since the monarchs of the Amalekites are called with a common name Agag, like those of the Egyptians, Pharaoh, etc. Compare Num. xxiv. 7; 1 Sam. xv. 8, 20, 32.

14. God commands Moses to record the victory gained over Amalek, which was the first and therefore pre-eminently most interesting event in the military history of Israel, for an eternal memorial *in the book* (בַּסֵּפֶר), by no means in *a* book, as the English version renders. The definite article, which is implied in בַּסֵּפֶר (instead of בְּהַסֵּפֶר), shows clearly that here a book known to Moses is alluded to. This was already observed by Ebn Ezra, who further remarks: "And this is the book of the Law, or any other book, which they had, perhaps the Book of the Wars of the Lord (ספר מלחמות יי); but it is now lost, like many other books, as for instance, the Book of the Righteous (ספר הישר)." But if we compare our verse with similar notices in other passages of the Pentateuch, it is clear almost to certainty, that here the "Book of Moses" is understood. We find in Exod. xxiv. 4, 7, that Moses, after having communicated the laws to the Israelites, wrote all the words of the Lord in the Book of the Covenant, which he read to the whole people (see note on that passage). A similar command is given to Moses by God in Exod. xxxiv. 27. According to Num. xxxiii. 1, 2, Moses wrote down all the journeys of the Israelites on the injunction of the Lord. Compare also Num. xxxvi. 13; Deut. xxviii. 61. It is, therefore, probable, that Moses committed to writing all the occurrences and laws, as they happened and were revealed to him, and that he thus gradually finished the four first books of the Pentateuch. Later, the Deuteronomy, or the repetition of the Law, was added, in which, indeed, the precept concerning the extirpation of Amalek is repeated with great emphasis (xxv. 17—19); as the execution of this decree was several centuries later, commanded to Saul in 1 Sam. xv. 2, 3 (see on ver. 8). It is, therefore, very doubtful to suppose with Ebn Ezra, that this section was written down in the fortieth year of the wanderings of Israel, which conjecture would lead us to very confused ideas concerning the composition of the Pentateuch. But it is still less admissible to assume with Vater and others who deny the universal acquaintance with the art of writing in the time of Moses, that *writing* (כתב) always denotes in the Pentateuch engraving in stone. We do not see what those critics gain by such conjecture, as engraving in stone presupposes quite as much the use of the art of writing (see note on v. 6). זכרון, the accusative of the purpose, instead of לזכרון *for a memorial.*—The combat with Amalek was especially to be enjoined to Joshua, because "God knew that he would have to fight with the kings of Canaan" (*Ebn Ezra*), or "as he was

and his hands were steady until the setting of the sun.
13. And Joshua discomfited Amalek and his people with
the edge of the sword. 14. And the Lord said to Moses,
Write this *for* a memorial in [1]the book, and rehearse *it* in
the ears of Joshua; for I will utterly blot out the remem-
brance of Amalek from under heaven. 15. And Moses
built an altar, and called the name of it, "[2]The Lord is

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—A book. [2] JEHOVAH Nissi.

destined to lead the Israelites into the Holy Land, he should enforce upon them the duty to repay him what he had done to them" (*Rashi*); but especially, no doubt, because Moses had then already selected Joshua as his successor (see note on ver. 9).—The emphatical expression מחה אמחה וכ׳ "I will utterly efface the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven," is thus accounted for by Ebn Ezra: "He had provoked the wrath of the Lord; for whilst the princes of Edom, the Moabites, and Philistines were overwhelmed with fear on account of the signs He had done in Egypt and at the Red Sea; this Amalek came, notwithstanding, to combat against Israel and had no fear of God."

15. Moses built there ("on the Horeb," *Ebn Ezra*) an altar, and called it יי׳ נסי, "the Lord is my banner." Thus translate Mendelssohn, Rosenmüller, De Wette, Zunz, and many others. Some leave the words untranslated, as Luther, and the English Version. The Septuagint renders, καταφυγή μου (as if derived from נוס, to flee), and the Vulgate, exaltatio mea. Onkelos paraphrases: "he prayed before God, who had done miracles for him." So also Rashi: "God has done us here a miracle" (נֵס). But נס is here evidently the *banner*, round which the troops rally, and which indicates to them whither they have to turn in combat; so that God is considered as the centre of the army of Israel, an appropriate idea, to which the explanation given in ver. 11 would also be adapted. (Compare Numb. xxi. 9; Psa. lx. 6; Isa. v. 26). The construction of the word יי׳ נִסִּי is, according to Ebn Ezra, מזבח ליי׳ נסי, "the altar of God, my banner." By this appellation of the altar, the whole honour of the victory is ascribed to God alone, and it is, at the same time, clearly shown to the murmuring people, that God is really among them (ver. 7).

16. ויאמר כי יד על כס יה. These difficult words, which have experienced very various explanations, contain, indubitably, a reason and argument, why Moses called the altar יי׳ נסי, "God is my banner," as the causal conjunction, כִּי, sufficiently shows. A causal-nexus exists, therefore, between these words and the preceding verse. Now, many interpreters, as Clericus, Michaelis, Gesenius, De Wette, and others, have endeavoured to establish that relation by reading נֵס instead of כֵּס, and translating: "The altar was called, God is my banner, because the hand (of Moses) was at the banner of God (the miraculous staff)." Compare Gen. xvi. 13. But this explanation is not only questionable on account of the arbitrary alteration of the text, כס into נס, but also on account of the obscure logical connection which this change would yield with the succeeding words, "war of the Lord against Amalek, from generation to generation." The ancient expositors, as Targum Onkelos, Ebn Ezra, Rashi, Rashbam, and others, have therefore taken כֵּס as an abbreviated or apocopated form, instead of כִּסֵּא, throne (as the Samaritan codex really reads), and explained our words as an oath, which is the most clearly thus expressed by Onkelos: "This is proclaimed with an oath, and it has been issued from the face of the Omnipotent, whose majesty is on the throne of glory, that war be waged

מֹשֶׁה מִזְבֵּחַ וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמוֹ יְהוָה ׀ נִסִּי׃ 16 וַיֹּאמֶר כִּי־יָד עַל־כֵּס יָהּ
מִלְחָמָה לַיהוָה בַּעֲמָלֵק מִדֹּר דֹּר׃ פ

against the children of Amalek, to extirpate them in future time." (See also Ebn Ezra and Rashi. Similarly, English Version, Lengerke, and others). Thus explains also Bishop Patrick, that the expression, "to lay the hand on the throne," points to a custom which was, in some countries, connected with solemn oaths, as in other countries the hand was, on such occasions, put on the altar. In this custom, the phrase originated, "to put the hand on the altar," instead of "to swear"; and, therefore, says Juvenal (xiii. 89), of those impious people who feel no compunctions of conscienee in committing perjury: "they touch the altars without fear." In this sense, God charged His people here to exterminate the Amalekites. But, against such explanation, we must object, that it would require the first words of our verse to be, "for the hand of God was upon His throne;" and that thus, also, the connection between this and the preceding verse would not be clear. It is, therefore, preferable to explain: for the hand (of Amalek) was on the throne of God, that is, the people of Israel, which God had selected for Himself as His throne or particular abode on earth (see on xix. 5, 6; 1 Chron. xxix. 23); and the connection would be thus: God is my banner, and He will eternally

פ פ פ

יח 1 וַיִּשְׁמַע יִתְרוֹ כֹהֵן מִדְיָן חֹתֵן מֹשֶׁה אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה
אֱלֹהִים לְמֹשֶׁה וּלְיִשְׂרָאֵל עַמּוֹ כִּי־הוֹצִיא יְהוָה אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל

CHAPTER XVIII.

Summary.—When Jethro learnt the miraculous deliverance of Israel, and the prominent part which Moses, his son-in-law, had taken on all occasions, he proceeded to him to Mount Horeb, in the vicinity of which Israel encamped, and brought to him his wife Zipporah, and his two sons, Gershom and Eliezer, whom he had sent back to Midian, when on his way to Egypt. Moses received Jethro cheerfully, who, on his part, showed also sincere sympathy for the extraordinary events in favour of Israel. When he saw, the next day, the great burden of judicial labours which rested upon Moses alone, he advised him to divide the people numerically into sections of ten, fifty, a hundred, and a thousand persons, and to appoint over every section a subordinate judge, who should decide all minor disputes, whilst only the more important differences, which could not be settled by them, should be brought before Moses as the supreme court of appeal (see on ver. 21). Moses readily accepted the proposal, and put it into immediate execution.

1. Some ancient interpreters, as Ebn Ezra (on ver. 13) and Rashbam, whom several modern critics, as Ranke (Untersuchungen, i. p. 83), have followed, are of opinion, that the narration concerning Jethro, which is here inserted, does not stand in its proper place, and that the arrival of Jethro took place only in the second year after the legislation, or after the erection of the Tabernacle. As reasons, Ebn Ezra mentions: 1. That according to ver. 12, עולה and זבחים "a burnt-offering and eucharistic sacrifices" were killed, whilst nothing has been related about the building of a new altar. 2. The words in ver. 20: "and thou shalt illustrate to them the ordinances, and laws," point to the time after the legislation. 3. That Moses encamps, according to ver. 5, by "the mountain of God." 4. That according to Num. x. 30, Jethro returned to his home (ver. 27), only when the Israelites departed from Horeb; and 5. That the new arrangement of Jethro, explained in our chapter, took place not earlier than in the time of that departure.

my banner." 16. For he said, [1]Because the hand *was* against the throne of God; *therefore* the Lord *will have* war with Amalek from generation to generation.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—The Lord hath sworn that the Lord will have, etc.

fight against Amalek, who has wickedly raised his hand against His people. About יד in this meaning, see Genesis xvi. 12.—*Fürst* (Concord. p. 562) derives כִּסֵּא from כסה, and believes that כס and כסא are analogous to תור and תורה (1 Chron xvii. 17). The Septuagint translates: ὅτι ἐν χειρὶ κρυφαίᾳ πολεμεῖ Κύριος, and seems to have read בְּיָד כְּסִיָּה. Vulgate: "quia manus solii Domini et bellum Domini erit contra Amalec;" in which translation the preposition על is omitted. According to Scaliger, Luther, and others, יד is here *a monument;* as 1 Sam. xv. 12; 2 Sam. xviii. 18; and Salomon translates, therefore, "For it is a monument at the side of God's throne," that He will for ever wage war against Amalek; and explains: "that at the side of the throne of God in heaven also a memorial (זכרון ver. 14) stands, to remind Him, that the wickedness of Amalek be never forgotten." However, without urging that this symbolical interpretation of על כס would be very forced and strange in our context, the erection of the real altar is, by that hypothesis, but very artificially accounted for.—About the connection of our passage with 1 Sam. xv., see *Hengstenberg*, Authent. ii. p. 309—313.

Chap. XVIII. 1. When Jethro, the priest of Midian, Moses' father-in-law, heard of all that God had done for Moses, and for Israel His people, that the Lord had

—And that sagacious commentator explains this irregularity in the narrative by the supposition, that after the hostilities of Amalek, the benevolence and kindness of Jethro was to be mentioned, whilst others (as Rashbam) account for it by the opinion, that the divine laws, given at Sinai (chap. xix. to Num. x) should not be interrupted by human institutions recommended by Jethro, (which reason is also adopted by Ranke, *loc. cit.*). —But if Jethro really arrived only after the legislation, nothing prevented the sacred writer from mentioning his arrival after Numbers x. The words in ver. 20, may simply refer to the Sabbath and other general precepts, and similar expressions are already used in xv. 25. That the "mountain of God" is mentioned cannot appear surprising, as Moses was, even according to xvii. 6, on mount Horeb. There is, therefore, no reason to doubt, that Jethro arrived already now, during the second month after the exodus. And this is even necessary, if we consider, that while Moses communicates to Jethro the rescue from various dangers, and all the miracles (ver. 8), the greatest and most remarkable wonder, the revelation and legislation, is not mentioned by the remotest allusion, which would be perfectly improbable if that revelation had already taken place.—It is further unnecessary, to recur, with Philippson, Herxheimer, and others, to the conjecture, that although Jethro arrived already now, he proposed and organized his institutions much later, after the legislation, after having convinced himself, by longer observation, of the requirements and wants of the people. For the word ממחרת, in ver. 13, "on the following day," compels us to suppose the schemes of Jethro to have been devised the very day after his arrival; for to explain it with Rashi: "on the day after that on which Moses came the second time from the mountain," is absolutely against the connection of the text. Numerous disputes must have necessarily arisen among so large a host as the Israelites then were; nobody was more appropriate to decide

מִמִּצְרָיִם׃ 2 וַיִּקַּח יִתְרוֹ חֹתֵן מֹשֶׁה אֶת־צִפֹּרָה אֵשֶׁת מֹשֶׁה אַחַר
שִׁלּוּחֶיהָ׃ 3 וְאֵת שְׁנֵי בָנֶיהָ אֲשֶׁר שֵׁם הָאֶחָד גֵּרְשֹׁם כִּי אָמַר
גֵּר הָיִיתִי בְּאֶרֶץ נָכְרִיָּה׃ 4 וְשֵׁם הָאֶחָד אֱלִיעֶזֶר כִּי־אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי
בְּעֶזְרִי וַיַּצִּלֵנִי מֵחֶרֶב פַּרְעֹה׃ 5 וַיָּבֹא יִתְרוֹ חֹתֵן מֹשֶׁה וּבָנָיו
וְאִשְׁתּוֹ אֶל־מֹשֶׁה אֶל־הַמִּדְבָּר אֲשֶׁר־הוּא חֹנֶה שָׁם הַר הָאֱלֹהִים׃
6 וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־מֹשֶׁה אֲנִי חֹתֶנְךָ יִתְרוֹ בָּא אֵלֶיךָ וְאִשְׁתְּךָ וּשְׁנֵי בָנֶיהָ
עִמָּהּ׃ 7 וַיֵּצֵא מֹשֶׁה לִקְרַאת חֹתְנוֹ וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ וַיִּשַּׁק־לוֹ וַיִּשְׁאֲלוּ
אִישׁ־לְרֵעֵהוּ לְשָׁלוֹם וַיָּבֹאוּ הָאֹהֱלָה׃ 8 וַיְסַפֵּר מֹשֶׁה לְחֹתְנוֹ אֵת
כָּל־אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה יְהוָה לְפַרְעֹה וּלְמִצְרַיִם עַל אוֹדֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל אֵת

all those questions than Moses, who enjoyed the greatest authority; and he exercised the judicial functions according to his own judgment and discretion, even before he had been furnished with a code of laws by divine revelation.—The departure of Jethro is added in ver. 27 only in order to complete here the account concerning Jethro entirely (compare xvi. 35), and is repeated in Num. x. 29—32, in its due place. And justly remarks Philippson, that if we suppose, that Jethro returned to Midian already before the legislation, as is reported in ver. 27, he could have stayed with Moses but a few days, which would scarcely have sufficed for the organization of his new institutions, and which would hardly have been in accordance with the character of an Oriental visit in the desert.—But the mention of sacrifices (ver. 12) can, even before the legislation, not appear strange, as they were customary already from the times of Abraham, and were in use among all ancient nations (see note on ver. 12).—About Jethro and his different names see note on ii. 18; about "priest of Midian," on ii. 16.

2—5. About Zipporah, the wife of Moses, see note on ii. 21; about her return to Midian, to her father Jethro, after Moses had taken her and his children, Gershom and Eliezer, with him into Egypt, see note on iv. 20; and about the names of the children, on ii. 22. Ebn Ezra observes, on this occasion, that the etymological derivations of Biblical names do not always strictly harmonize with the grammatical rules or the roots of the radical words, and proves this position by various instances (קין from קניתי, Gen. iv. 1; נח from נחם, to console, Gen. v. 29, etc.). Modern critics have laid too much stress on remarks like this.—As Rephidim lies in the immediate vicinity of Horeb, and perhaps belongs even to the valleys of that chain of mountains, Moses might already be considered encamping at "the mountain of God." But the opinion of the Midrash that Jethro knew, that Moses would go to Horeb with the Israelites (iii. 12), because God had promised him this as "a sign," is untenable, because Moses had entirely concealed from Jethro the real motive of his return to Egypt (iv. 18).—בעזרי "in my help." Maurer remarks: "Some grammarians believe the prefix ב before עזרי to be the ב *essentiae*, as above in vi. 3 (באל שדי). Ewald (Gram. Crit. p. 607) explains our passage more correctly thus: The God of my fathers was in my help, that is, the abstract being used instead of the concrete noun, *among* my helpers; comparing Ps. liv. 6; cxviii. 7, etc. —If this is to signify, that Moses represented to himself several rescuers from his danger, and that God

brought Israel out of Egypt: 2. Then Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, took Zipporah, Moses' wife, after he had sent her back, 3. And her two sons; of whom the name of the one *was* Gershom; for he said, I have been an alien in a strange land: 4. And the name of the other *was* Eliezer; for the God of my father, *said he*, *was* my help, and delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh: 5. And Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, went with his sons and his wife to Moses in the desert, where he encamped *at* the mountain of God: 6. And he [1] sent word to Moses, I thy father-in-law Jethro come to thee, and thy wife, and her two sons with her.—7. And Moses went out to meet his father-in-law, and bowed down, and kissed him; and they asked each other of *their* welfare; and they went into the tent. 8. And Moses told his father-in-law all that the Lord had done to Pharaoh and to the Egyptians for Israel's sake, *and* all the trouble that had come upon them by the

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Said.

was but *among*, that is, one of them, it must be unhesitatingly rejected, as in the name אליעזר "God-help," no such questionable ideas are implied; and the words אלהי אבי בעזרי signify literally: the God of my fathers was for me to a help, that is, was my help.—The words אשר הוא חנה שם do not involve, that Moses had stayed there already "many days," which those are compelled to suppose, who start from the wrong conjecture, that Jethro came to Moses not before the erection of the holy Tabernacle (see on ver. 1).

6. *And he* (Jethro) *sent word to Moses*, through a messenger. The latter is often identified with him who sends him, and in whose name and commission he comes; see vii. 17; therefore is ויבא, in ver. 5, not: and Jethro *came* to Moses, but, he *went*, journeyed, to him.

7. On the words: "And Moses went out to meet his father-in-law," Ebn Ezra remarks, very characteristically: "because of Jethro's honour and wisdom; but he did not go to meet his wife and children, for it is not customary for a man of rank and authority to do this." About וישתחו, see on iv. 31. The Sept. translates ויבאו, καὶ εἰσήγαγεν αὐτούς, as if they had read ויביאום.

8. תלאה, from לאה, to be wearied, exhausted, see vii. 18, weariness, labour, toil; compare תעלה, channel, water-course, from עלה. Ebn Ezra explains, therefore, correctly: "a vexation which a man is tired of enduring or loth to relate; and the text alludes to the pursuit of the Egyptians, the attack of Amalek, and to the hunger and thirst, from all which calamities God had delivered them." ויצלם is pluperfect, because another pluperfect (מצאתם) precedes (compare Gen. xxvi. 18; and note on xi. 1); and after that verb is to be supplied, "from it;" so that the addition of the Septuagint, "from the hand of Pharaoh, and from the hand of the Egyptians," is superfluous.

9. וַיִּחַדְּ, and he rejoiced, from חדה, to rejoice (compare חדוה, joy), instead of וַיִּחְדֶּה, and, therefore, the dagesh lene remains in the ד, even after the ה is apocopated (as in וַיֵּשְׁתְּ, instead of וַיִּשְׁתֶּה,

כָּל־הַתְּלָאָה אֲשֶׁר מְצָאָתַם בַּדֶּרֶךְ וַיַּצִּלֵם יְהוָה׃ 9 וַיִּחַדְּ יִתְרוֹ עַל
כָּל־הַטּוֹבָה אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה יְהוָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר הִצִּילוֹ מִיַּד מִצְרָיִם׃
10 וַיֹּאמֶר יִתְרוֹ בָּרוּךְ יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הִצִּיל אֶתְכֶם מִיַּד מִצְרַיִם וּמִיַּד
פַּרְעֹה אֲשֶׁר הִצִּיל אֶת־הָעָם מִתַּחַת יַד־מִצְרָיִם׃ 11 עַתָּה יָדַעְתִּי
כִּי־גָדוֹל יְהוָה מִכָּל־הָאֱלֹהִים כִּי בַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר זָדוּ עֲלֵיהֶם׃ 12 וַיִּקַּח
יִתְרוֹ חֹתֵן מֹשֶׁה עֹלָה וּזְבָחִים לֵאלֹהִים וַיָּבֹא אַהֲרֹן וְכֹל ׀ זִקְנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל לֶאֱכָל־לֶחֶם עִם־חֹתֵן מֹשֶׁה לִפְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים׃ שני
13 וַיְהִי מִמָּחֳרָת וַיֵּשֶׁב מֹשֶׁה לִשְׁפֹּט אֶת־הָעָם וַיַּעֲמֹד הָעָם עַל־מֹשֶׁה

etc.); but the ת takes a pathach, being a guttural.

10. אתכם, *you*; Moses and Aaron, the agents of God, and the instruments of redemption, and, as such, the most exposed to danger, are placed in juxtaposition to the people of Israel.—*Out of the hand of the Egyptians, and out of the hand of Pharaoh*; first, the generic noun (the Egyptians), and then the principal individual of this genus: "out of the hand of the Egyptians, and *especially* out of the hand of Pharaoh," as in Isa. i. 1, על יהודה וירושלים, "on Judah, and especially on Jerusalem."

11. *Now I know that the Lord is greater than all gods* (compare xv. 11, and note on vi. 7).—כי בדבר אשר זדו עליהם. In order to arrive, in the easiest manner, at a clear understanding of these difficult words, we compare with them the parallel passage in Neh. ix. 10, where we read: "thou didst wonders against the Egyptians (כי ידעת כי הזידו עליהם), for thou knewest that they (the Egyptians) acted wickedly against them (the Israelites)." Hence we see, that זדו and עליהם, belong together, and thus are at once excluded the translations of Zunz and Salomon: "for that, with which they acted wickedly, came upon them," of the English Version, "For in the thing wherein they dealt proudly he was above them," and of Vater: "just in the very thing with which they (the heathen gods) boast (namely, their power to protect the nations which worship them), He is above them." The ancient interpretations take, indeed, those two words together, but explain, more symbolically than literally: "in the same element (the water) by which the Egyptians intended to destroy the Israelites, they were themselves overwhelmed, and thus God glorified Himself." Thus translate the Targumim, Rashi, Abarbanel, and even Fagi, Michaelis, and Mendelssohn ("Denn mit derselben Sache wurden sie gestraft, mit welcher sie Tyrannei ausgeübt haben"). The sense, however, is almost correctly expressed by Rashbam's simple explanation: "for on their account (of the Israelites) God has shown Himself powerful against the Egyptians." A similar meaning lies in the words of the Septuagint: "for the reason that (כי בדבר) they acted wickedly against them;" Vulgate: "eo quod superbe egerint contra illos;" Luther: "darin dass sie Hochmuth an ihnen geübt haben." But this general sense receives only its distinct character by the correct conception of כי, which, pointing back to עתה, in the beginning of the verse, is here intended to generalize and enhance the praise and greatness of God: even in that very circumstance that the Egyptians acted tyrannically against the Israelites, God showed His greatness; the wickedness of the Egyptians became, in the hand of God, an instrument to display His omnipotent power. See note on xiv. 4: "and

way, and [1]*from which* the Lord had delivered them. 9. And Jethro rejoiced for all the goodness which the Lord had done to Israel, whom He had delivered out of the hand of the Egyptians. 10. And Jethro said, Blessed *be* the Lord, who hath delivered you out of the hand of the Egyptians, and out of the hand of Pharaoh; who hath delivered the people from under the hand of the Egyptians. 11. Now I know that the Lord *is* greater than all the gods: [2]yea, by the *very* thing, that they acted wickedly against them. 12. And Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, took a burnt offering and *eucharistic* sacrifices for God: and Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel, to eat with Moses' father-in-law before God.—13. And it came to pass on

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—How. [2] For in the thing wherein they dealt proudly *he was* above them.

I will be honoured through Pharaoh, and through all his host, that the Egyptians may know that I am the Lord." Similar, but, in our opinion, not sufficiently clear and simple, is the explanation of Philippson: "just then, when they (the Egyptians and their gods) acted wickedly against the Israelites, they prevailed nothing against God, but He subdued them." זוד, or זיד, originally, to boil over, then, to overflow; therefore, to act passionately, violently, or wickedly; hence, זדון, petulance, intentional malice (Deut. xvii. 12), opposed to שגגה, error committed through inadvertency (Levit. iv. 2, 27; Numb. xv. 27).

12. Out of gratitude to God, and of joy at the miraculous deliverance of Israel, Jethro offered עלה, and זבחים, to God (לאלהים); and Moses and Aaron, and all the elders of Israel, participated in the feast (לחם, see note on xvi. 3), prepared on this occasion, so that it took place, as it were, before God (לפני האלהים). We remark here, but briefly, that עלה, a burnt-offering, was entirely burnt to the Lord, whilst זבח, or the eucharistic offering was, with the exception of certain pieces of fat, which were burnt on the altar, and the breast and right shoulder, which belonged to the priest, consumed, on the same or the following day, in a convivial repast, by the Israelite, his family, and the guests whom he invited, and among whom the Levites and the poor were never forgotten (compare Levit. iii. 3, *et seq.*, 14, 15; vii. 31, *et seq.*; Deut. xxvii. 7; xii. 6, *et seq.*; 1 Sam. ix. 19; xvi. 2, 5; 2 Sam. vi. 19; Deut. xii. 12). The accurate details concerning the sacrifices, will be explained in the course of this commentary in their due places. Although Jethro was a heathen priest, he seemed now to have been induced, by the manifest omnipotence of the God of Israel, to acknowledge and to adore Him; and as it was to Him that he offered sacrifices, the Israelites could, consistently, take part in the meal connected with them. "It was not necessary to mention here Moses expressly, as the meeting took place in his tent" (*Ebn Ezra, Rashbam*). Such sacrificial feasts were, on joyful occasions, celebrated, not only by the Israelites, but by almost all nations of antiquity, and the Homeric poems are replete with instances, and detailed and interesting descriptions of such meals (see *Feith*, Antiq. Hom. I. x. 7; *Stuck*, Antiq. Conviv. i. 33). לקח, in the signification of *offering, sacrificing*, see Exod. xxv. 2.

13. *And it came to pass on the following morning*, that is, the day after the arrival

מִן־הַבֹּקֶר עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ 14 וַיַּרְא חֹתֵן מֹשֶׁה אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־הוּא
עֹשֶׂה לָעָם וַיֹּאמֶר מָה־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה עֹשֶׂה לָעָם מַדּוּעַ
אַתָּה יוֹשֵׁב לְבַדֶּךָ וְכָל־הָעָם נִצָּב עָלֶיךָ מִן־בֹּקֶר עַד־עָרֶב׃ 15 וַיֹּאמֶר
מֹשֶׁה לְחֹתְנוֹ כִּי־יָבֹא אֵלַי הָעָם לִדְרֹשׁ אֱלֹהִים׃ 16 כִּי־יִהְיֶה לָהֶם
דָבָר בָּא אֵלַי וְשָׁפַטְתִּי בֵּין אִישׁ וּבֵין רֵעֵהוּ וְהוֹדַעְתִּי אֶת־חֻקֵּי
הָאֱלֹהִים וְאֶת־תּוֹרֹתָיו׃ 17 וַיֹּאמֶר חֹתֵן מֹשֶׁה אֵלָיו לֹא־טוֹב
הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה עֹשֶׂה׃ 18 נָבֹל תִּבֹּל גַּם־אַתָּה גַּם־הָעָם הַזֶּה
אֲשֶׁר עִמָּךְ כִּי־כָבֵד מִמְּךָ הַדָּבָר לֹא־תוּכַל עֲשֹׂהוּ לְבַדֶּךָ׃ 19 עַתָּה
שְׁמַע בְּקֹלִי אִיעָצְךָ וִיהִי אֱלֹהִים עִמָּךְ הֱיֵה אַתָּה לָעָם מוּל הָאֱלֹהִים
וְהֵבֵאתָ אַתָּה אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים׃ 20 וְהִזְהַרְתָּה אֶתְהֶם
אֶת־הַחֻקִּים וְאֶת־הַתּוֹרֹת וְהוֹדַעְתָּ לָהֶם אֶת־הַדֶּרֶךְ יֵלְכוּ בָהּ
וְאֶת־הַמַּעֲשֶׂה אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשׂוּן׃ 21 וְאַתָּה תֶחֱזֶה מִכָּל־הָעָם אַנְשֵׁי־

of Jethro, who, therefore, proposed at this early period his new judicial organization (see on ver. 1). עמד, is usually construed with על, because those who stand, generally reach *above* those who sit; see *Ewald's* Gram. § 548. 1, *a*. *γ*. We find, therefore, in that preposition here, no collateral signification, as, for instance, that of a "thick crowd around him," etc. העם, denotes here, naturally, those only who happened to have law-suits.—*From the morning to the evening.* That this does not mean the precise astronomical morning and evening, is too evident to induce us to quote Ebn Ezra's exposition on these words.

14. The stress, in Jethro's question, lies in the circumstance, that Moses judges, single-handed, the whole people, not, as Rashi and others believe, in the *sitting* of Moses, whilst he humiliates and degrades the people by letting them stand before him; which opinion has already been rejected by Ebn Ezra.

15, 16. The conjunction כי merely introduces the indirect speech, like ὅτι, in Greek, and is, therefore, not to be translated in English.—דרש אלהים, is a juridical phrase: to consult the judges, who are themselves called, in the Pentateuch, אלהים (see note on xxi. 6); and the adoption of Jethro's institutions, by which many other Israelites were also appointed as judicial functionaries (see on ver. 21), shows sufficiently, that Moses, as judge, is here not considered as the special "mouth of God," or His inspired instrument. We cannot, therefore, find, in the answer of Moses: "The people come to me to enquire of God" (that is, to hear my juridical decision), any direct insinuation that Moses could not well choose other judges besides himself, since the people came to enquire of *God* (*Rashbam*, *Rosenmüller*, and others). It is, however, true, that in verse 16 a distinction seems to be made between judicial sentences and general religious and moral injunctions, which Moses makes to them according to the character of their disputes. דבר, matter, cause; Septuagint, *ἀντιλογία*, "dispute"; Vulgate, disceptatio, "quarrel." The circumstance, that בא is used in the singular, whilst the affix in להם stands in the plural, has induced Mendelssohn, Zunz, and others,

the following morning, that Moses sat to judge the people: and the people stood by Moses from the morning to the evening. 14. And when Moses' father-in-law saw all that he did to the people, he said, What *is* this thing that thou doest to the people? Why sittest thou thyself alone, and all the people stand by thee from morning to the evening? 15. And Moses said to his father-in-law, [1] The people come to me to enquire of God: 16. When they have a matter, they come to me; and I judge between one and another, and I make *them* know the statutes of God, and His laws. 17. And Moses' father-in-law said to him, the thing that thou doest *is* not good. 18. Thou wilt surely wear away, both thou, and this people that *is* with thee: for this thing *is* too heavy for thee; thou art not able to perform it thyself alone. 19. Hearken now to my voice; I will give thee counsel, and God may be with thee: Be thou for the people instead of God, that thou mayest bring the causes to God: 20. And thou shalt teach them the ordinances and laws, and shalt show them the way wherein they must walk, and the work that they must do. 21. Moreover,

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Because the people.

to connect בא with דבר, and to translate: "If they have a dispute which comes before me." But, although the relative pronoun can be omitted in Hebrew (see ver. 20; compare vi. 28, etc.), the singular בא, refers, collectively, to the preceding העם, whilst the plural להם is used because it applies to individual members of the people. About חקי האלהים ואת תורתיו, see note on xv. 25.

18. נבל, to wither, to fade away, properly used of plants or trees; therefore figuratively: to be exhausted, to faint. Rashi, flétrir; Onkelos, מילאי תילאי; thou wilt weary thyself out.—כבד ממך הדבר, *this thing is too heavy for thee*. The preposition מִן is used in a similar manner in Gen. xviii. 14, היפלא מיי׳ דבר. See *Ewald*, Gram. Crit. p. 600. עֲשֹׂהוּ, infinitive of עשה, with the suffix of the third person singular masculine. The usual infinitive Kal, in status constructus עֲשׂוֹת, is here abreviated into עֲשׂוֹ, instead of the regular form עֲשׂה, as is the case in several other instances (עֲשׂוֹ Gen. xxxi, 18; רְאֹה Gen. xlviii. 11).

19, 20. *Be thou for the people*, מול אלהים, "in the face of God," or instead of God; that is, when their wisdom does not suffice, and the other judges now to be appointed are unable to decide, thou shalt act as the judge, who is instructed by God Himself, thou shalt answer them, and at the same time teach them wisdom and morality, or "fix laws, in order not to be required to be consulted in every single case" (*Rosenmüller*). Compare notes on iv. 6, and vii. 1, 2.

21. That the Israelites were perfectly unorganized in a judicial as well as in every other respect, is evident from the most cursory consideration of their condition in the Egyptian bondage (compare ii. 11, *et seq.*). The elders had a certain natural authority among them, as is usually the case among predominantly

חַיִל יִרְאֵי אֱלֹהִים אַנְשֵׁי אֱמֶת שֹׂנְאֵי בָצַע וְשַׂמְתָּ עֲלֵהֶם שָׂרֵי
אֲלָפִים שָׂרֵי מֵאוֹת שָׂרֵי חֲמִשִּׁים וְשָׂרֵי עֲשָׂרֹת׃ 22 וְשָׁפְטוּ אֶת־
הָעָם בְּכָל־עֵת וְהָיָה כָּל־הַדָּבָר הַגָּדֹל יָבִיאוּ אֵלֶיךָ וְכָל־הַדָּבָר
הַקָּטֹן יִשְׁפְּטוּ־הֵם וְהָקֵל מֵעָלֶיךָ וְנָשְׂאוּ אִתָּךְ׃ 23 אִם אֶת־הַדָּבָר
הַזֶּה תַּעֲשֶׂה וְצִוְּךָ אֱלֹהִים וְיָכָלְתָּ עֲמֹד וְגַם כָּל־הָעָם הַזֶּה עַל־מְקֹמוֹ

pastoral nations and tribes, and we have had more than one opportunity in the history of the deliverance of Israel to point out the sphere of action of the elders as representatives of the people, in their position to Moses and Pharaoh. But a greater internal unity of the people was naturally prevented by the jealous control and the invidious suspicion, with which they were treated by the Egyptian monarchs. The genius of Moses, whose mildness and humility rendered him, in the eyes of the people, both an object of admiration and affection, was the accidental centre, round which the Hebrew hosts gathered in the days of their redemption, and the universal confidence which his abilities and his virtues inspired, replaced, in that critical and exceptional time, the want of a well-balanced political system. But although the same patriotic zeal of Moses remained unabated even after the exode, it was unavoidable, that his strength should not, in some degree, succumb under the weight of his various avocations; and although the confidence of the people in their leader remained, on the whole, unshaken, the administration of justice especially, if exercised by one individual, must necessarily have taken a very slow and tiresome course, calculated to injure the interests, and to try the patience of the people (ver. 18). Jethro, therefore, who was himself, as the spiritual head of a numerous tribe, well acquainted with public affairs and popular administration, proposed the division of the people into numerical classes, in sections of ten, fifty, a hundred, and a thousand, most likely coinciding with the natural genealogical division into tribes, families and houses, and to appoint a judge over each of these divisions (compare Deut. i. 13, 15). It is probable, that a certain sub-ordination existed between these different sections, so that an appeal was permitted from the judge over ten to the judge over fifty, and from this to the judge over a hundred, and that, therefore, a cause which had not been decided to the satisfaction of both parties by the judge over a thousand, was brought before Moses himself (ver. 19). By this arrangement, Moses was naturally freed from a vast number of petty affairs, and he was now able to direct his attention chiefly to the general religious, moral, and material improvement of the people. This new organization permitted, besides, an easier control over the whole people, nor could it have been entirely without profit for military purposes (Num. xxxi. 14).—But, however great the advantages might have been, which Jethro's proposal offered, it is obvious, that it verged to the opposite extreme; now the *great number* of judges must have proved an essential encumbrance; for, if we suppose the people to have counted 600,000 men, there were not less than 60,000 judges over ten; 12,000 over fifty; 6,000 over a hundred, and 600 over a thousand, or an aggregate sum of 78,600 judges, which number was certainly unavailable for general deliberations. Therefore Moses saw, later, the necessity of surrounding himself with a senate (Synedrium) of seventy elders, who assisted him in all difficult matters and critical circumstances with their advice, and that authority which they enjoyed with the people, and who were at the same time intended "to temper, by this admixture of an aristocratical element, the appearance of a monarchy,

thou shalt select out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating unjust gain; and place *such* over them, *to be* rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens: 22. And let them judge the people at all times: and it shall be, *that* every great matter they shall bring to thee, but every small matter they shall judge: so [1]make it easier for thyself, that they may bear *the burden* with thee. 23. If thou wilt do this thing, and God command thee *so*, then thou wilt be able to endure, and all this people

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Shall it be easier.

which the sole legislation of Moses might have assumed" (*Michaelis*, Mos. R. i. 50). —We need scarcely remark, that the organization proposed by Jethro was only in force during the time of the wanderings of Israel in the desert; since the merely numerical division must naturally have become ineffectual, as soon as the Hebrews had settled in towns (Deut. xvi. 18). Hengstenberg (Auth. of the Pent. ii. p. 415—419) asserts, that these arrangements were, on the contrary, chiefly intended for the future Hebrew state in Palestine; but he feels himself, that such a complicated organization would have been impracticable, and proposes therefore the conjecture, that the numbers 1000, 100, 50 and 10, are not to be taken literally, but that they signify tribes, and large or small families, consisting of about that amount of souls. But although *thousand* (אלף) is sometimes used in the sense of *tribe*, it would be difficult to prove that *hundred*, or *fifty*, or *ten*, are applied synonymously with *family*.—It is supposed, and with probability, that Alfred the Great, who was well versed in the Bible, based his own Saxon constitution of sheriffs in counties, etc., on the example of the Mosaic division (compare *Bacon*, on Engl. Government, i. 70). An exactly similar system obtained in the kingdom of Peru (*Heriot's* Canada, p. 565).—It will not be found contradictory, that the appointment of the judges is in our passage placed before the arrival of the Israelites in the plains of Mount Sinai, whereas it is in Deut. i. 9—17, related immediately before the departure from Horeb. For the passage in Deut. comprises the whole time of the wanderings in its full extent (compare especially ver. 9, בעת ההיא).—חזה, to look out for, to appoint, like ראה in Gen. xxii. 8, and xli. 33.—אנשי חיל, *able men*. חיל, originally vigour, manliness, then applied to the activity of the mind and the heart, therefore entirely like the Latin virtus. Rashi: "opulent men, who have no occasion to flatter and judge after favour"; Ebn Ezra: "individuals who have strength to bear the burden, and fear *God*, but not men." אנשי אמת, men who love truth and right; אנשי בצע, those who hate bribery.—Not quite unfounded is the astonishment of Ebn Ezra, that Moses should have been able to find among the degenerated Israelites, who showed themselves now, and almost always during the wanderings in the desert, pusillanimous and refractory, 78,600 men of so distinguished and exalted qualities.

22 הקל מעליך, this is a constructio prægrans, for we have to supply: make the burden easier for thyself, *by taking it from thee*.

23. *And if God commands thee to do this*. For Moses was first to obtain the sanction of God for Jethro's proposals. Vater explains, against the context: "then thou wilt receive the commands of God." By these new arrangements

יָבֹא בְשָׁלוֹם׃ שלישי 24 וַיִּשְׁמַע מֹשֶׁה לְקוֹל חֹתְנוֹ וַיַּעַשׂ
כֹּל אֲשֶׁר אָמָר׃ 25 וַיִּבְחַר מֹשֶׁה אַנְשֵׁי־חַיִל מִכָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּתֵּן
אֹתָם רָאשִׁים עַל־הָעָם שָׂרֵי אֲלָפִים שָׂרֵי מֵאוֹת שָׂרֵי חֲמִשִּׁים
וְשָׂרֵי עֲשָׂרֹת׃ 26 וְשָׁפְטוּ אֶת־הָעָם בְּכָל־עֵת אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַקָּשֶׁה
יְבִיאוּן אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וְכָל־הַדָּבָר הַקָּטֹן יִשְׁפּוּטוּ הֵם׃ 27 וַיְשַׁלַּח
מֹשֶׁה אֶת־חֹתְנוֹ וַיֵּלֶךְ לוֹ אֶל־אַרְצוֹ׃ פ רביעי

Moses will be able to bear the weight of occupations, and the people will, with cheerfulness and satisfaction, return home (על מקמו) from the tribunals, as they would find an easy and expeditious jurisdiction.

25. The Samaritan text has, instead of this verse, with slight alterations, all that which Deut. ix. 1—18 contains on this subject; that must, however, be considered as a spurious gloss intended to amplify our text.

26. The futures ושפטו (for such it is in sense, on account of the Vav conver-

יט 1 בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁלִישִׁי לְצֵאת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם בַּיּוֹם
הַזֶּה בָּאוּ מִדְבַּר סִינָי׃ 2 וַיִּסְעוּ מֵרְפִידִים וַיָּבֹאוּ מִדְבַּר סִינַי וַיַּחֲנוּ

CHAPTER XIX.

Summary.—On the first day of the third month, the Israelites arrive in the desert of Sinai, and encamp in the valleys before the mountain. Moses is charged by God to propose to the Israelites the question, whether they will accept His precepts, and keep the covenant which He intended to make with them; for then they would be His chosen and holy people. The Israelites promise obedience and willingness. In order to enhance the authority of Moses in the eyes of the people, and to make them fully believe in his divine mission, God speaks to him from the top of the mountain, in the presence of the whole nation; and He commands, that the Israelites, even the priests, should sanctify themselves two days, and, on the third, keep themselves ready for the divine revelation, during which they were forbidden to approach the mountain, which was fenced for this purpose. God appears under thunder and lightning, clouds and fire, to the trembling people. After Moses had, once more, on the command of God, warned the people, he ascended the mountain, accompanied by Aaron; and the Lord proclaimed the decalogue.

1, 2. From Rephidim, which, although its exact identity is now doubtful, certainly lies in the vicinity of Horeb, and between this mountain and Wadi esh-Sheikh, the Israelites marched towards their great immediate aim, the desert of Sinai, where they encamped "in the face of, or before the mountain" (נגד ההר, ver. 2), or, "beneath it" (בתחתית ההר, ver. 17). We remind the reader, here, from our description of the peninsula of Sinai, only of the fact, that probably the whole group of mountains which covers this region, was called "Mount Horeb" (see xvii. 6; xviii. 5), whilst the southern and higher peak bore the name of Sinai (p. 63). The Hebrew nation, therefore, coming from the north, encamped in the plains which surround Mount Sinai, and so that they had the mountain before them, and could see from all parts the thunders and lightnings which raged around its head. Both an accurate comparison of the respective passages of the holy books, and probability and tradition, oblige us to consider

will also go to their place in peace.—24. So Moses hearkened to the voice of his father-in-law, and did all that he had said. 25. And Moses chose able men out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens. 26. And they judged the people at all times: the difficult causes they brought to Moses, but every small matter they judged themselves.—27. And Moses let his father-in-law depart; and he went his way into his own land.

sivum), יביאון, and ישפוטו, denote the often repeated, usual action (which notion is also contained in בכל עת, "at any time"): they *would* judge, they *would* bring, etc. The form יִשְׁפּוּטוּ, instead of יִשְׁפְּטוּ, is formed after the analogy of the Chaldee, for the pure vowel O of the future singular (יִשְׁפֹּט), is but rarely retained; but, if this is the case, it is usually changed into וּ, because this vowel is considered shorter than וֹ; so לֹא תַעֲבוּרִי, Ruth ii. 8; see note on xv. 5.

27. See note on ver. 1, at the end.

Chap. XIX. 1. On the third [1]new-moon after the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day came they *into* the wilderness of Sinai. 2. Namely, they journeyed from Rephidim and came *to* the desert of Sinai, and encamped in the wilder-

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Month.

that southern mountain Sinai as that on which the revelation was proclaimed. Thus only it can be accounted for, that the divine manifestation is sometimes said to have taken place on Horeb (the general term), and sometimes on Sinai (the individual peak). Further, the Sinai, being the higher mountain of the two, could best be seen from all parts, and in the different valleys; and, lastly, Mohammedan tradition calls the Sinai "the mountain of Moses." The objection which has often been raised against this locality, that it offered no great plain for the extensive camp of the Hebrew hosts, is already removed by that which we have observed. For the Israelites encamped, 1st, only "in the desert" (במדבר); 2nd, "before the mountain," so that they could see it; and this was possible from the numerous small valleys which surround the group of the Horeb. It is even much more appropriate to suppose, that the people encamped, distributed after tribes and families, and in single groups, throughout the valleys, than that they were all pressed together near one part of the mountain, where the great crowd of the people might have been attended with the most dangerous consequences (ver. 21). Robinson arrived, by careful examination, at the conviction, that here was space enough to satisfy all the requisitions of the scripture narrative, so far as it relates to the assembling of the congregation to receive the law (Biblical Researches, i. 141). And yet did Robinson only know the plain Er-Rahah, at the north-east extremity of Horeb. But, since his time, the existence of the plain Wadi Sebaiyeh, at the southern base of Sinai, has been fully established, not only by Laborde, but also by the American traveller, M. K. Kellog, who has attentively examined the surrounding localities of Mount Sinai. That valley

בַּמִּדְבָּר וַיִּחַן־שָׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל נֶגֶד הָהָר׃ 3 וּמֹשֶׁה עָלָה אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים

forms, with the Wadi er-Rahah, and the Wadi Sheikh, one continuous plain, for about twelve miles northwards. It is, on the east, bounded by mountains with long sloping bases, and covered with wild thyme and other herbs. "The width of the plain immediately in front of Sinai, is about 1,600 feet, but, further south, the width is much increased, so that, on an average, the plain may be considered as being nearly one-third of a mile wide, and its length, in view of Mount Sinai, between five and six miles." It thus furnished ample tenting-ground for the hosts of Israel. The general silence of eastern travellers, with regard to this southern plain, Wadi Sebaiyeh, may be traced to the circumstance that, on passing from Mount St. Catharine, eastward beyond the valley El-Ledsha, high granite spurs, generally surrounded by deep and rugged gorges and ravines, or water-courses, separate Wadi Sebaiyeh from Sinai; and from no part of the narrow path which lies between those spurs and the mountain, and which is usually taken by the travellers, is the southern plain visible. But, although Dr. Robinson was not aware of this valley, his observations do by no means compel us "to throw aside all our faith in tradition," with which they stand in full harmony; nor is it necessary to suppose, with others (as *Kitto*, Scripture Lands, p. 67), that the Israelites, to reach that valley, "must have continued their march much further down the coast than on the other supposition, and turned, at a bolder angle, up into the mountains, near the modern town Tur, or Tor; and that Dophkah, Alush, and Rephidim, must be transferred to other localities;" all this is unnecessary, for the Wadi Sebaiyeh is, in fact, nothing but the continuation of Wadi esh-Sheikh, with which it is connected by the Wadi er-Rahah. Thus, all circumstances speak for the authenticity of our text, and of tradition.

In opposition hereto, however, the opinion has most frequently been advocated, that the revelation took place on *Mount Serbal*, which is surrounded by wide plains, suitable for a camp of the Israelites. Mount Serbal lies in a north-westerly direction from the group of Sinai, from which it is separated by Wadi Osmet. Namely, from Wadi Taibe, which lies a few hours south of Wadi Gharendel (אלים), on the coast of the Gulf of Suez, the mountain-chains run farther eastward into the interior of the peninsula, so that from there a long, gradually-widening, arid plain is formed, which extends to the southern point of the peninsula, the Ras Mohammed. In this direction follow, after the Wadi Taibe, successively, the Wadis Nasseb, Mokatteb, Feiran, and Nadie, in the south of which rises Mount Serbal. We will not urge here the circumstance, that it would be very difficult to identify the journeys of the Israelites from Marah and Elim down to Mount Serbal, if this were the next aim of their marches, as we have tried to prove at the single stations; we will only endeavour to refute the arguments which, for instance, Kitto (Pict. Bible, i. p. 189) has advanced in its favour. He adduces, 1st. The *height* of Mount Serbal, which made it most eligible for the divine legislation. But the Serbal is not the highest mountain of the peninsula; we have already observed (p. 63), that it is the Mount St. Catharine, to the west of Horeb and Sinai: 2nd. The *abundance of valleys* round the Serbal; which point we have already answered in the foregoing remarks: 3rd. The passages, Deut. xxxiii. 2: "The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir to them; He shone forth from Mount Paran,....from His right hand came a fiery law for them," and Habak. iii. 3: "The Lord came from Teman, and the Holy One from Mount Paran." This Mount Paran is, by Kitto, considered identical with Mount Feiran (see *supra*). Even if we acknowledge this hypothesis, we must observe, that, if Paran is so literally taken as a mountain in the vicinity of Sinai, we must suppose the same

ness; and there Israel encamped before the mountain. 3. And Moses went up to God, and the Lord called to

of the region of Seir, which, however, extends from the Dead Sea to the Elanitic Gulf, and lies very considerably north of Feiran. The same must be said of Teman, a country in the east of Idumæa. Further, the part where the revelation took place is frequently called Horeb, which scarcely applies to Mount Serbal, much less to Feiran and Seir. The preposition מִן, in the passages above quoted, shows merely the direction from some part: God came, as it were, from the north, from the Holy Land, His usual abode, to Mount Sinai, in order to reveal Himself there in glory to Moses. He further adduces as proof, 4th. *Tradition*, which mentions the Serbal as the mountain of legislation. How uncertain such traditions are, and how ready the Bedouins show themselves to give to any locality every desired significance, has been acknowledged by all travellers (see *supra*, on xiv. 1–3, p. 239). But, in this instance, even tradition speaks for Mount Sinai, where "the convent of Mount Sinai" was founded already in the sixth century of the vulgar era (527); and undoubtedly the emperor Justinian followed, in its establishment, the tradition then prevailing. It is, therefore, indisputable, that not the Serbal, but the Sinai, is the mountain of revelation.

1. *On the third new moon* (בחדש השלישי) after the departure (לצאת) of the Israelites from Egypt, they arrived just on that first day of the month (ביום הזה) in the desert of Sinai.—חדש must, therefore, here be taken in its original signification of *novilunium*, new moon (from חדש, to renew itself), as in 1 Sam. xx. 24; xxii. 5; 2 Kings iv. 23, etc. Thus it is already understood by Jonathan: בחד לירחא, "on the first day of the month;" others, arbitrarily: on the third or fifth day. The third month was later called Sivan (Esth. viii. 9). See note on xii. 2.

2. ויסעו is explanatory of the preceding verse: *namely*, they journeyed from Rephidim and came to the desert of Sinai. About נגד ההר, see *supra*. Glaire translates: "Vis-à-vis de la montagne *de ce nom*" (Sinai), which sense he finds implied in the article in ההר. According to Jewish tradition, Moses ascended the mountain on the second day of Sivan (ver. 3); on the third, he received the answer of the people (ver. 7); on the fourth, he ascended the mountain for the second time (ver. 8); then followed the days of preparation, on the fourth and fifth; and, on the sixth, the revelation of the decalogue took place. The three days before the sixth of Sivan are called "the three days of separation" (שלשת ימי הגבלה). See vers. 12, 14, 23. Compare also note on xxiii. 16. At Mount Sinai the Israelites stayed almost a whole year, from the first day of the third month in the first year of their wanderings, to the twentieth of the second month in the second year (Numb. x. 11); and received here, during this period, the legislation in almost all its details. This is, perhaps, the only part of the peninsula which, abounding in fountains and green pastures, permitted so long a sojourn to the numerous people and their many herds.

3–6. Already from the beginning of his mission Moses had fostered the great idea, to bestow upon the Israelites not only liberty but truth;—not only to lead them from the inauspicious soil of Egypt, but to train them to useful and vigorous citizens of the promised land (see iii. 12). Little would their liberty have availed them, had they, in the obstinacy of their hearts, and the darkness of their minds, undertaken a planless march in the unknown solitudes of the desert. Moses, therefore, led them now, under divine direction, into a district, in which they could, secluded from all toils and struggles of human pursuits, and only a few times disturbed from their rest by transitory hostile attacks, receive in collected tranquillity the laws of their legislator. This was thus most properly a time of

וַיִּקְרָא אֵלָיו יְהוָה מִן־הָהָר לֵאמֹר כֹּה תֹאמַר לְבֵית יַעֲקֹב וְתַגֵּיד
לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ 4 אַתֶּם רְאִיתֶם אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי לְמִצְרָיִם וָאֶשָּׂא
אֶתְכֶם עַל־כַּנְפֵי נְשָׁרִים וָאָבִא אֶתְכֶם אֵלָי׃ 5 וְעַתָּה אִם־שָׁמוֹעַ
תִּשְׁמְעוּ בְּקֹלִי וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת־בְּרִיתִי וִהְיִיתֶם לִי סְגֻלָּה מִכָּל־הָעַמִּים
כִּי־לִי כָּל־הָאָרֶץ׃ 6 וְאַתֶּם תִּהְיוּ־לִי מַמְלֶכֶת כֹּהֲנִים וְגוֹי קָדוֹשׁ

instruction and education, during which their thoughts were exclusively engaged with this one grand object. But Moses, on the point of carrying the great and difficult work into execution, is anew reminded of the improbability, that a people, which seemed sunk in the meanest materialism, and which thought liberty itself too dearly bought by a few short privations, should possess a degree of self-denial and spiritualism, such as was requisite for the understanding of the purest religious doctrines. Therefore he proposes to them once more, in the name of God, the question, whether, in grateful reminiscence of His loving protection, they were determined to obey His commandments, and to preserve the covenant which He now intended to renew with them on a still more sacred basis (vers. 3—6). Only after the people had solemnly and unanimously promised this (ver. 8), follow the direct preparations for the revelation of God and the promulgation of the law (ver. 10, *et seq.*).

3. *And Moses went up to God*, that is, on the mountain of God, as the Sept. even translates. Abarbanel takes these words spiritually: Moses occupied his mind with the holiest ideas of God, but without leaving his tent. However ingenious such symbolical interpretations may be, the clear context of this and many other passages does not permit us to abandon the simple and literal acceptation.

4. God spoke to Moses *from the mountain*, that is, according to ver. 20, from the top of it, in solemn words and poetical parallelism; and this sublime form of the divine address is intended to place in a more expressive light the importance and significance of the question (כה תאמר לבית יעקב ותגיד לבני ישראל). God reminds the Israelites appropriately first of the special providence, with which He had hitherto treated them, as they had seen *themselves* (אתם), how He had delivered them from the oppression of the Egyptians, and, with a beautiful and deep poetical phrase, "borne them on eagles' wings and brought them to Himself." The strength and majesty of the eagle, the rapidity of his flight, and his power to shield his young from the attacks of other birds, and by his high soaring to protect them even from the arrows of the hunter, render him an eminently appropriate image of comparison for the omnipotence of God, with which He had rescued Israel from all dangers, the calamity of hunger and thirst, and the attack of the enemies. But by tenderness for his young also is the eagle distinguished (*Ælian.* ii. 40; *Oppian.* iii. 115. See, however, *Arist.*, Hist. An. ii. ix. 34). The same image, in which the care of God for Israel is compared with the strength and tenderness of the eagle, is more carried out in Deut. xxxii. 11: "As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings: So the Lord alone did lead them," etc.—Rabbinical interpreters urge the word על, and explain: whilst all other birds carry their young between their feet through the air, because they fear the attack of stronger and higher flying birds, the eagle bears them on his wings, as he has not to fear any other bird, but only the arrows of men, and prefers rather to be pierced himself, than to witness the death of his young; "thus

him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel: 4. You have seen what I did to Egypt, and *how* I bore you on eagles' wings, and brought you to myself. 5. Now, therefore, if you will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then you shall be a peculiar treasure to me above all nations: for all the earth *is* mine: 6. And you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation. These

the Egyptians threw swords and spears, but the pillar of cloud kept them off."—The words: "and I brought you to myself," are taken too externally by those who explain them: I brought you to my mountain, the Horeb. They stand in close relation with the beginning of this verse, and form the strongest confirmation of our foregoing remark. The Israelites had, on the one side by the Egyptian servitude, on the other, by the Egyptian idolatry, with which they had contaminated themselves, swerved far from God, His purity and sanctity, in a word, from truth and genuine faith; now God, in graciously granting them His revelation and His pure doctrines, brings them again back to Himself; He intends to make them "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." And in this sense translates Onkelos: "and I brought you to my service" (לפולחנא דילי), and still more distinctly explains Rashbam: "that I may be your God." Now the Lord commands the Israelites to listen to His voice; and this is explained by the following words, that they shall keep His covenant, which He makes with them anew by the legislation, and by which their old relation as covenanters of God was to be enlarged and strengthened.

5. *Then you shall be a peculiar treasure* (סגלה) *to me.* Thus the people of Israel are called in several other passages also, as Deut. vii. 6; xiv. 2; xxvi, 18; and סגלה is usually employed in the meaning of *treasure, wealth* (Eccl. ii. 8; 1 Chron. xxix. 3). Israel was, then, intended to be the selected treasure of God among all nations (Levit. xx. 26; Ps. cxxxv. 4), *although the whole world belongs to Him* (כי לי כל הארץ): as He, therefore, is the Lord of all, the often repeated, absurd remark, that in the Pentateuch God is represented merely as the particular deity of Israel, and as it were but as a national God, is sufficiently refuted. We have already had other opportunities to expose that fallacy (see note to vi. 7; compare *Cusari* i. 27, 94, 102).

6. The Israelites shall be to God *a kingdom of priests and a holy nation* (ממלכת כהנים וגוי קדוש). It is unnecessary to seek with some interpreters (as *Michaelis*, Mos. R., § 34), in these words exactly the intimation, that as in Egypt and some other eastern countries the priests formed the favoured, and often the governing caste, thus the Israelites should, as it were, have a part in the government of God with a peculiar privilege. The phrase: "you shall be to me *a holy nation*," expresses merely, that God wished to consider *all* Israelites as His priests, that is, as the religious officers consecrated to His service, who, therefore, are to Him particularly dear on account of their piety and holiness, and whom He favours with His special protection. Not individual privileged members of the people, but the whole community shall stand in the nearest and closest connection with God, and be participant of His inspirations. The Israelites should be among the other nations, what the priests are in *one* nation; they were selected to propagate the doctrine of God, and thus to become the teachers and prophets of the nations. The priests form, in many respects, the medium between God and the people;

אֵלֶּה הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר תְּדַבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ חמישי 7 וַיָּבֹא

they "bring the people to God" (ver. 4); and thus it was the grand vocation of Israel to be the medium between the nations of the earth and God, to bring all the nations to God, and thus ultimately to form one whole with the rest of the world, to cease to be a *chosen* people, because they had made the truth of God a common property of mankind. The resigning of its peculiar glory was the signal of the perfect triumph of Israel. The words of our text describe, therefore, the notion of the "government of God," or *theocracy*, as the Hebrew state is usually called: God is the supreme invisible king, whom all citizens serve as priests, but so that an earthly king, as His human representative, is thereby not excluded (see Judg. viii. 23; 1 Sam. viii. 7). The word theocracy is first used by Josephus (Contr. Ap. ii. 16), who remarks: "Some legislators have permitted their governments to be under monarchies, others put them under oligarchies, and others under a republican form; but our legislator had no regard to any of these forms, but he ordained our government to be what, by a strained expression, may be termed a *theocracy*, by ascribing the authority and the power to God, and by persuading all the people to have a regard to Him." From these words the character and the signification of a theocracy are clearly discernible; where God rules as a king, every subject is, as it were, a priest, and every civil action assumes the sanctity of a religious function; idolatry becomes an offence against His sovereignty (crimen majestatis), and was, therefore, punished with death (Deut. xvii. 2); and from the same principle blasphemy, false prophecy, profanation of the Sabbath, and witchcraft, were persecuted with the same extreme punishment; and even disrespect against elders, judges and parents, who were considered, in certain respects, as the representatives of God, was severely punished; in fact, every law, however unimportant in appearance, assumes the dignity of a precept commanded by the eternal King; and its transgression is a violation of His sovereignty. Further, the whole land belongs to God; the people are but its tenants; nobody has, therefore, the right of transferring his landed property to others; it returns in the jubilee to its former owner, or to his heirs. Again, the Israelites are the subjects of *God;* they are His servants for ever; slavery was, therefore, excluded; the servant went out free in the seventh year; and if he declined to accept the liberty, he was branded with a mark of ignominy, because he refused the immediate sovereignty of God. A direct consequence of the theocratical government was, the office of prophecy. The prophets are inspired by God; they are His mouth; their dicta are the words of God; and disobedience to the prophets is a breach of the allegiance due to God. But the prophets had no legislative power, nor had they any regular or clearly defined political influence; it was their task merely to exhort the people to remain faithful to the law of God, and to keep aloof from every idolatrous abomination. This was their duty; in all other respects they were merely advisers; they had no authority to introduce a new law, or to reform an old one, except in so far as their moral influence swayed the people. The prophets were the messengers of God to preserve the pure monotheism and the genuine theocracy.— God is the only legislator; the Law is the eternal unalterable guide of the people, the supreme will, the centre of the whole political existence; it is the revelation of God, through which He reigns; the Law is, therefore, the only standard of the theocracy. It was only in exceptional cases, that the will of God interfered directly in the affairs of the nation through lots or through the Urim and Thummim (see notes to the various laws, chap. xx—xxxiii.). But Israel is holy only in so far, and because it stands under the immediate influence of God;

are the words which thou shalt speak to the children of Israel. 7. And Moses came and called for the elders of

the people itself has no majesty except that which reflects upon it by the holiness of God; the dignity of the community rises, the more it approaches God; it is destroyed by idolatry and disbelief. A crime against the *majestas populi*, as such, is therefore unknown to the Mosaic law; it becomes punishable only when its purport and tendency is directed against God Himself, and thus assumes the character of high treason. And because all Israelites are subjects of the same eternal and perfect King, they are all equal in dignity, in rights and duties; there is no difference of classes, of ranks, or castes; all citizens enjoy unlimited liberty and scope for the development of their spiritual nature; no barrier excludes the poorest to rise, by the power of the mind, to the highest authority, even that of a prophet; for a degradation of one class would have annihilated the holiness of the people as an undivided community. But that liberty could never degenerate into anarchy or disorder, as long as the nature of their common Monarch, whose infinite holiness they were ordered to imitate, remained clear before their internal eye; pride and ambition were naturally checked by the thought, how unspeakably remote even the highest human perfection must inevitably be from that eternal model; and the consciousness to be destined as a holy people, far from fostering a feeling of vanity or haughtiness, was eminently calculated to sow daily the seeds of lowliness and humble contrition.—The Israelites were not the only people who had a theocratical form of government; the Egyptian kings also pretended to rule in the name and as the representatives of the gods, and so even at present the monarchs of Persia and Thibet. But these theocracies had, and have, no influence on the position and character of the *people;* the monarchs assumed their presumptuous titles, only to raise *themselves* and to degrade *their nations;* the heathen theocracies were, therefore, but other names for the most absolute despotism, and the sources of the grossest abuse and the darkest superstition, whilst the Hebrew theocracy had an immediate, ennobling influence upon the citizens, whom it elevated into the rank of priests, and who enjoyed all the same political and religious privileges; it consisted merely in the one elevating idea, that God, invisible, omniscient, and eternal, hovered over the people; that the king was but the first servant of the Lord; and that both the people and the king had to render account for all their deeds before His supreme tribunal. The Hebrew theocracy was thus also widely different from a hierarchy, or government of priests, who had, constitutionally, no political power whatever (see note on ver. 22); the tribe of Levi furnished merely the priests, not the Judges and kings, not even necessarily the prophets; it was not in the exclusive possession of the knowledge of the law, and could therefore not acquire any dangerous spiritual ascendance; it was, on the other hand, the only tribe which obtained no landed property, and it was thus deprived of the chief means of gaining material influence. How different was all this in the Egyptian caste of priests!—As God reminds here (in ver. 4) the people, through Moses, that they have seen themselves all miracles, and that they could, therefore, not doubt of a special providence exercised in their favour, we insert the following excellent passage from *Stollberg's* History of Religion (ii. p. 58): "If Minos, the legislator of the Cretans, pretended to have every nine years communions with Jupiter in a cavern; if Lycurgus, the legislator of the Lacedæmonians, raised his influence by an oracle of Apollo; and Numa, Rome's second king, supported his authority by a feigned intercourse with the nymph Egeria, who he said instructed him in a grotto near her fountain; if Zamolxis, the lawgiver of the Getae, ascribed his wisdom to

מֹשֶׁה וַיִּקְרָא לְזִקְנֵי הָעָם וַיָּשֶׂם לִפְנֵיהֶם אֵת כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה
אֲשֶׁר צִוָּהוּ יְהוָה׃ 8 וַיַּעֲנוּ כָל־הָעָם יַחְדָּו וַיֹּאמְרוּ כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּר
יְהוָה נַעֲשֶׂה וַיָּשֶׁב מֹשֶׁה אֶת־דִּבְרֵי הָעָם אֶל־יְהוָה׃ 9 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה
אֶל־מֹשֶׁה הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי בָּא אֵלֶיךָ בְּעַב הֶעָנָן בַּעֲבוּר יִשְׁמַע הָעָם
בְּדַבְּרִי עִמָּךְ וְגַם־בְּךָ יַאֲמִינוּ לְעוֹלָם וַיַּגֵּד מֹשֶׁה אֶת־דִּבְרֵי הָעָם
אֶל־יְהוָה׃ 10 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵךְ אֶל־הָעָם וְקִדַּשְׁתָּם

Vesta; and Odin carried constantly with him the embalmed head of Mimer, to whom he imputed oracular inspirations; if Manko-Kapak spread the belief, that he descended from the sun, in order to enlighten Peru's people; and Mohammed listened to the wisdom, which his dove whispered into his ear, as Sertorius, in Lusitania, followed the secret suggestions of his hind; all these extraordinary men understood well, that a certain divine authority was required, to diffuse new systems and new ideas among whole nations, and to make them act in accordance therewith. What those men effected very imperfectly by more or less gross illusions, was executed by God, whom the whole of nature obeys, in a manifest and awful manner, by perpetually continued wonders, witnessed by a whole nation."—It is here, perhaps, the place also for briefly enumerating and characterizing the different names of Israel as a people, and in its relation to God. 1. Israel is the *son of God*, because they acknowledge Him as the father of mankind, and the Author of the universe (בן; Exod. iv. 23; Jer. iii. 19; Deut. xxxiii. 6. Mal. ii. 10, etc.). 2. Israel is His *firstborn son*, because they were His earliest worshippers (בן בכור; Exod. iv. 22; see our note there), or, with a similar metaphor, the *first-fruits of His increase* (ראשית תבואתו; Jer. ii. 3; compare ἀπαρχή). 3. It is the *people of God*, because He is their king and ruler (עם יי; Num. xvii. 6); or 4. His *inheritance*, which belongs to Him for ever (נחלת יי; Deut. iv. 20; Ps. xxxiii. 12, etc.), for He has *acquired* them (קנה) as His property by manifold acts of love, especially by the Egyptian redemption (see on xv. 13). 5. His *peculiar people* or *treasure*, which He has singled out among all nations to propagate His truth (סגלה; xix. 5, etc.), and therefore *Israel* (ישראל), the *warrior of God*. 6. The *people κατ' ἐξοχήν*, since they are, as the reverers of His will, the most glorious nation on earth (עם; Deut. xxxiii. 29; 2 Sam. vii. 23; עם גדול; Deut. iv. 6, 7, 8). 7. The Israelites are in the same sense, the *chosen* ones, whom God shields with particular care and His special providence (בחורים; Isa. lxv. 9; Ps. cv. 6; not like ἐκλεκτοί, in Book of Wisd. xiv. 15); or 8. His *flock*, which He pastures and protects (עדר יי, or צאן מרעה יי; Jer. xiii. 17; xxiii. 1), and God Himself is the shepherd (רעה; Ps. lxxx. 2, etc.). 9. They are the *holy people*, because God their king is holy (קדשים; Lev. xi. 44; xx. 7, 8, etc.); or *a kingdom of priests* (ממלכת כהנים; see on ver. 6). 10. The *wise people*, because the law of the Lord enlightens the mind (Deut. iv. 5—8), as, on the contrary, the idolators are denominated *foolish* or *blinded* (נבל; Ps. xiv. 1; lxxiv. 8, etc.). 11. The *pious* or *righteous people*, because they know the precepts of God, which ennoble the soul (ישרים, חסידים, צדיקים; Ps. xiv. 5; Num. xxiii, 10, etc.), and therefore Jeshurun (ישורון), the pious nation; or with a poetical simile, the *turtle-dove* of God (תור; Ps. lxxiv. 19), whereas, on the other hand, the heathens are called *the wicked* (רשעים; Ps. ix. 6, 18; x. 4, 11, etc). 12. The *humble*, *meek*, and *lowly*, who modestly submit to the divine

the people, and laid before them all these words which the Lord had commanded him. 8. And all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do. And Moses returned the words of the people to the Lord. 9. And the Lord said to Moses, Behold, I come to thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee, and believe in thee for ever. And Moses told the words of the people to the Lord.— 10. And the Lord said to Moses, Go to the people, and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash

precepts (דכים, דלים, ענוים ואביונים; Ps. ix. 10, 11, 13, etc.), in opposition to the heathens, who are called *the rebellious*, because they revolt against God's will (סוררים; Ps. lxviii. 19; compare Ps. ii. 1, 2, etc.). But 13. the most developed and, perhaps, one of the most beautiful allegories concerning the relation between God and Israel, is that of the sacred matrimonial alliance. God is the husband or the father; the people is the wife or the mother; the individual citizens, the children; the whole of Israel, the house or family of God (בית יי; Hos. viii. 1, etc.; compare בת עמי and בתולת בת עמי, or בתולת ישראל); and therefore idolatry is, from another point of view, nothing less than adultery (זנות), and every idol a *strange* God (זר, or אחר; compare Isai. i. 21; Jer. ii. 2, 25; li. 5; Hos. v. 7; Ps. xliv. 21, etc., etc.).—All these appellations are convincing proofs of the pure spirituality with which God is conceived and represented throughout the whole Old Testament; and if we find a distinct and self-conscious opposition between Israel and the other nations, this expresses nothing more than an undeniable historical truth, and is neither the dictate of pride, nor of national exclusiveness (see note on vi. 7).

7—9. Moses now proposes, through the elders, the question, to the people, whether they were willing to conclude the renewed covenant with God under the condition of a perfect obedience to His commands, and they answered unanimously with a hearty affirmative (compare xxiv. 3). The people are permitted free choice, either to accept or to refuse the new covenant; the obligation is made perfectly mutual; and so Israel submits, with voluntary consent, to the rule of God, and to His laws; their liberty and free agency is thus secured and respected, and, however severe some of the laws might be, however decided the government of God might, in some instances, appear, they cannot complain of tyrannical arbitrariness; they have declared, consciously and deliberately, that they agree with the conditions proposed to them. It is, therefore, the most unhappy mistake, if some writers, even men with historical and philosophical impartiality, have spoken of the "theocratical despotism of the Mosaic law."—Moses returns the reply of the people to the Lord, who descends to him in a cloud, before the eyes of the people, that all might henceforth firmly believe in the mission and holiness of Moses (ver. 9; compare Deut. xiii. 2, *et seq.*); and here he communicated to God the answer of the people; so that the repetition of the same words, in ver. 9 (ויגד משה את דברי העם אל יי) does not indicate a *double* answer.—God spoke to Moses *in a thick cloud*, "whilst the cloud sent forth thunder and lightning, the signs of divine presence." The construction of בעב הענן, is the same as in בגדל זרועך, in xv. 16, which see.

10, 11. As God intends now to appear to the people in all His glory, in order to grant the light of truth to the

הַיּוֹם וּמָחָר וְכִבְּסוּ שִׂמְלֹתָם׃ 11 וְהָיוּ נְכֹנִים לַיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי כִּי
בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִשִׁי יֵרֵד יְהוָה לְעֵינֵי כָל־הָעָם עַל־הַר סִינָי׃ 12 וְהִגְבַּלְתָּ
אֶת־הָעָם סָבִיב לֵאמֹר הִשָּׁמְרוּ לָכֶם עֲלוֹת בָּהָר וּנְגֹעַ בְּקָצֵהוּ כָּל־
הַנֹּגֵעַ בָּהָר מוֹת יוּמָת׃ 13 לֹא־תִגַּע בּוֹ יָד כִּי־סָקוֹל יִסָּקֵל אוֹ־
יָרֹה יִיָּרֶה אִם־בְּהֵמָה אִם־אִישׁ לֹא יִחְיֶה בִּמְשֹׁךְ הַיֹּבֵל הֵמָּה יַעֲלוּ

chosen people, they must prepare themselves for this most solemn act of their history, by internal and external sanctification (ver. 10), and by abstaining from all sensual and earthly enjoyments (ver. 15). And in order to fill the minds of the people with a still deeper impression of the sanctity of the revelation, they are, under penalty of death, forbidden, neither to ascend the mountain, nor to approach it (ver. 12; compare xxxiv. 3); for God intended, as a spirit, to reveal Himself to their *spirits* only. The whole succeeding description of the fiery appearance of God, in lightning and thunder, and clouds, and the smoke of Sinai, and the terrible sound of the trumpet, is so majestically sublime and grand, that it could only issue from a mind which, overwhelmed by the omnipotence, and grandeur, and majesty of God, exhausts the whole scanty store of human language to utter but a faint expression of the agitated sentiments of the soul.—The *sanctification* (וקדשתם) took place among the Hebrews always before a great and solemn act (compare Gen. xxxv. 2; Josh. iii. 5), in order thus to enhance the internal elevation by the external purity; but this virtue of purity is generally raised, among the Orientals, to the importance of a religious duty (see note on iii. 5). Targum Onkelos takes וקדשתם, more distinctly: "thou shalt *prepare* them," ותזמנינון, as Rashi and Rashbam also explain. The Septuagint inserts, after לך, the word והעד (*διαμάρτυραι*), as in ver. 21. וכבסו, *and they shall wash*; Onkelos, ויחורון. The two days of preparation are, according to tradition, the fourth and fifth of Sivan (see *supra*, on vers. 1, 2), whilst, on the following day, the sixth of the same month, the revelation took place (ver. 11).—"God will descend," that is, He will manifest His presence to the people by thunder, lightning and fire. Maimonides (Moreh, i. 10) explains ירד here, as in ver. 20, and Gen. xi. 7; xviii. 21: "God *condescended* to appear to Moses," which would, however, scarcely be suitable to our context.

12. והגבלת. *And thou shalt set bounds* to the people. Onkelos, ותתחם, "thou shalt make a certain boundary" (compare גבול, border, boundary).

13. So severely was a profane approach to the mountain interdicted during the divine appearance, that those who transgressed this command, and thus forfeited their lives, were not even allowed to be touched; but, from afar, they were to be killed with stones, or pierced with arrows; to kill them on the spot would have compelled the people to follow them to the sacred locality; for the Sinai was now considered as the dwelling-place of God, the Most Holy, and only the most distinguished of the community were permitted to approach it on the command of God; and in order to make Moses again known and revered as the true servant of God, he was now alone allowed to ascend to that habitation of the divine presence.—The infinitive *Kal*, is emphatically placed before the verb finite, here in *Piel*, in סָקוֹל יִסָּקֵל, as in Gen. xxxvii. 33, before the Pual; compare 2 Kings iii. 23, where the infinitive Hophal stands before the preterite of the Niphal. The form יִיָּרֶה, instead of יִוָּרֶה (future Niphal of ירה); for the verbs פ״י, retain, sometimes, the י, in the future of the Niphal; compare יִיָּחֵל, in

their clothes: 11. And be ready for the third day: for on the third day the Lord will come down before the eyes of all the people upon Mount Sinai. 12. And thou shalt set bounds to the people round about, saying, Take heed to yourselves, *that you* go *not* up into the mountain, or touch the border of it: whosoever toucheth the mountain shall surely be put to death: 13. There shall not a hand touch [1]him, but he shall surely be stoned, or shot through; whether *it be* beast or man, it shall not live. When the trumpet [2]soundeth, they shall go forward to the mountain.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—It. [2] Soundeth long.

Gen. viii. 12; and 1 Sam. xiii. 8.—במשך היבל המה יעלו בהר. In order to arrive at a correct explanation of these difficult and much disputed words, we observe: 1st. יובל is identical with קרן היובל, the horn of the jubilee, Josh. vi. 5; and synonymous with שופר, with which it is joined, in the plural, in the same sense: שופרות יובלים; Josh. vi. 6; viii. 13: 2nd, משך היבל, or משך בקרן היבל (Josh. vi. 5), is, besides תקע בשופרות, the usual phrase for: "to blow the trumpet," so that it neither signifies, "to draw out long the same tone" (*Rashi*, English Version, and others), in opposition to the gradually swelling tone of the Shofar (ver. 19), nor: "when the sound of the trumpet ceases" (Septuagint, *ὅταν αἱ φωναὶ καὶ αἱ σάλπιγγες καὶ ἡ νεφέλη ἀπέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους*, *Rashbam*, *Geddes*): 3rd, המה, cannot, as Ebn Ezra, and others, believe, refer to Moses, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and the seventy elders (xxiv. 1), as Nadab, Abihu, and the elders, are not even alluded to in the preceding narrative of our chapter; it must, rather, be referred to the people, mentioned in ver. 12: 4th, however, as the people were expressly, and under penalty of death, forbidden even to approach or touch the mountain during the appearance of God, which yet took place amidst the blowing of the trumpet (ver. 19), our text cannot possibly intimate, that the people, as soon as they heard the sound of the horn, should ascend the mountain (יעלו בהר), which would be a most strange contradiction, and which fact is, indeed, nowhere hinted at in the following narrative. We must, rather, suppose, that the words: "they shall go, בהר," are identical with the circumstance related in ver. 17, namely, that Moses, when the Shofar sounded loud, led the Israelites from the camp (בתחתית ההר, ver. 17) "to the foot of the mountain" (see also Deut. iv. 11); we translate, therefore, המה יעלו בהר, simply: "the people shall *go forward to the mountain*," of course beyond the boundary which Moses had fixed (ver. 12); compare the similar use of עלה in xxiv. 9 (compare ver. 14). That the preposition ב, is applied after verbs of motion likewise, is well known, for instance, Gen. xix. 8, באו בצל, "they came *to* the shadow"; xxxi. 33, ויבא לבן באהל־יעקב, "Laban came *into* the tent of Jacob"; see Levit. xvi. 22; Deut. vii. 20, etc. The etymology of יובל is uncertain; according to Onkelos (דכריא), the Talmud (Rosh. Hash. 26), and Ebn Ezra (who, like the Talmud, believes it to be an Arabic word), it means *ram*, so that קרן יובל, would be the horn of a ram. This opinion has been successfully refuted by *Fuller* (Miscell. iv. 8), and *Carpzov* (Antiq. Sacr. Cod. p. 449). The supposition adopted by Gesenius (Thes. p. 561), and many modern interpreters is, that יוֹבֵל coincides with יָבַל, jubilee, and that it is, therefore, the trumpet, with which, originally, the year of jubilee, then all festivals and other holy or

בָּהָר׃ 14 וַיֵּרֶד מֹשֶׁה מִן־הָהָר אֶל־הָעָם וַיְקַדֵּשׁ אֶת־הָעָם וַיְכַבְּסוּ
שִׂמְלֹתָם׃ 15 וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־הָעָם הֱיוּ נְכֹנִים לִשְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים אַל־
תִּגְּשׁוּ אֶל־אִשָּׁה׃ 16 וַיְהִי בַיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי בִּהְיֹת הַבֹּקֶר וַיְהִי קֹלֹת
וּבְרָקִים וְעָנָן כָּבֵד עַל־הָהָר וְקֹל שֹׁפָר חָזָק מְאֹד וַיֶּחֱרַד כָּל־הָעָם
אֲשֶׁר בַּמַּחֲנֶה׃ 17 וַיּוֹצֵא מֹשֶׁה אֶת־הָעָם לִקְרַאת הָאֱלֹהִים מִן־
הַמַּחֲנֶה וַיִּתְיַצְּבוּ בְּתַחְתִּית הָהָר׃ 18 וְהַר סִינַי עָשַׁן כֻּלּוֹ מִפְּנֵי
אֲשֶׁר יָרַד עָלָיו יְהוָה בָּאֵשׁ וַיַּעַל עֲשָׁנוֹ כְּעֶשֶׁן הַכִּבְשָׁן וַיֶּחֱרַד
כָּל־הָהָר מְאֹד׃ 19 וַיְהִי קוֹל הַשֹּׁפָר הוֹלֵךְ וְחָזֵק מְאֹד מֹשֶׁה
יְדַבֵּר וְהָאֱלֹהִים יַעֲנֶנּוּ בְקוֹל׃ ששי 20 וַיֵּרֶד יְהוָה עַל־
הַר סִינַי אֶל־רֹאשׁ הָהָר וַיִּקְרָא יְהוָה לְמֹשֶׁה אֶל־רֹאשׁ הָהָר וַיַּעַל
מֹשֶׁה׃ 21 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה רֵד הָעֵד בָּעָם פֶּן־יֶהֶרְסוּ אֶל־

national convocations (מקראי קדש) were proclaimed, and which was also used in war (Josh. vi. etc.).

14. Moses *sanctified* the people, that is, he impressed upon them the sanctity and sublimity of the approaching revelation, and thus hallowed their minds.

15. Among almost all ancient nations, abstinence from conjugal intercourse before the performance of certain holy duties was a religious command. This is reported by Herodotus concerning the Babylonians, Arabians, and the Egyptians (i. 198; ii. 61); compare *Porphyrius*, De Abstinentia, lib. iv. cap. 7. The same was the practice among the Greeks (*Meursius*, Eleusin., cap. 7), and the Romans (*Tibullus*, lib. II. eleg. i. 11), and is still now among the Mohammedans, when they visit the holy places of Mecca (compare also *Ovid*. Metam. x. 434, *et seq.*; *Juvenal*, vi. 535, *et seq.*). Quite inadmissible is, therefore, the conjecture of Clarke, and others, to take אִשָּׁה here in the sense of אֵשׁ; "do not approach the *fire*."—לשלשת ימים, is identical with בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי, in vers. 11, 16.

16. We refrain from analyzing the single features, and the progress of the signs under which God's majesty revealed itself to the overwhelmed people in that solitary wilderness, convinced that the simple, yet most vigorous and impressive, description of the holy text cannot fail to produce a powerful effect upon the mind of the susceptible reader (see on ver. 10). We need, therefore, scarcely point out the absurdity of the opinion, that Moses availed himself of an *earthquake*, with volcanic eruptions, to force laws upon the terrified people, in the name of the deity. The "trembling of the mountain" (ver. 18) is sufficiently accounted for by the vehement thunder, and is a usual image of the mighty appearance of God (Ps. xviii. 8, etc). As the only illustration, we quote here the parallel passage from Deut. iv. where several points, here but briefly alluded to, are more distinctly developed. Ver. 11: "And you approached, and stood under the mountain; and the mountain burned with fire to the very heart of heaven, with darkness, clouds, and thick clouds. Ver. 12: And the Lord spoke to you out of the midst of the fire: *you heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; you heard only a voice.* Ver. 13: And He declared to you His covenant, which He commanded you to perform, ten command-

—14. And Moses went down from the mountain to the people, and sanctified the people; and they washed their clothes. 15. And he said to the people, Be ready for the third day; do not approach a woman.—16. And it came to pass on the third day, in the morning, that there were thunders and lightnings, and a heavy cloud upon the mountain, and the voice of the trumpet exceedingly strong; so that all who *were* in the camp trembled. 17. And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp towards God; and they placed themselves at the nether part of the mountain. 18. And Mount Sinai was entirely in smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mountain quaked greatly. 19. And when the voice of the trumpet sounded louder and louder very much, Moses spoke, and God answered him by a voice. 20. And the Lord came down upon Mount Sinai, on the top of the mountain: and the Lord called Moses *up* to the top of the mountain; and Moses went up. 21. And the Lord said to Moses, Go down, [1]warn the people, lest they break through to the Lord to see, and

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Charge.

ments; and He wrote them upon two tables of stone. Ver. 15: Take you therefore, good heed to yourselves; for you saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spoke to you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire. Ver. 33: Did ever people hear the voice of God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as thou hast heard, and live?" (see ver. 36).

17. See note on ver. 13.

18. *And Mount Sinai was entirely in smoke.* "Those dense clouds from which thunders broke forth had the appearance of smoke" (*Rosenmüller*).—מפני אשר, *on account of*, therefore, because; compare viii. 20; Jer. xliv. 23.

19. *By a voice;* that is, Moses spoke to God (ver. 21—24), and God answered with a voice loud enough to surpass the sound of the trumpet; not "in thunder," as Rosenmüller, De Wette, and others explain.

20. We need scarcely remark, that all expressions here used with reference to God, and all actions ascribed to Him, are only employed by the inspired writer to make himself understood by man, and to convey, by external notices, a faint idea of the spiritual and supernatural workings of the Eternal. This circumstance is here elucidated by Ebn Ezra, in a longer disputation, and pointed out by Rashi, on ver. 11 (כדי לשבר את האזן מה שיכולה לשמוע). See note on ii. 25.

21. העד בעם; *charge the people;* Onkelos, אסהיד, "testify"; Septuagint, *διαμάρτυραι*; or, as Rashi explains, "warn them (התרה בהם) not to go up the mountain."—פן־יהרסו, lest they break through, that is, through the boundary which separates them from the mountain of God.—רב, "many,"

יְהֹוָה לִרְאוֹת וְנָפַל מִמֶּנּוּ רָב׃ 22 וְגַם הַכֹּהֲנִים הַנִּגָּשִׁים אֶל־יְהֹוָה
יִתְקַדָּשׁוּ פֶּן־יִפְרֹץ בָּהֶם יְהֹוָה׃ 23 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־יְהֹוָה לֹא־
יוּכַל הָעָם לַעֲלֹת אֶל־הַר סִינָי כִּי־אַתָּה הַעֵדֹתָה בָּנוּ לֵאמֹר הַגְבֵּל
אֶת־הָהָר וְקִדַּשְׁתּוֹ׃ 24 וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו יְהֹוָה לֶךְ־רֵד וְעָלִיתָ אַתָּה
וְאַהֲרֹן עִמָּךְ וְהַכֹּהֲנִים וְהָעָם אַל־יֶהֶרְסוּ לַעֲלֹת אֶל־יְהֹוָה פֶּן־יִפְרָץ־
בָּם׃ 25 וַיֵּרֶד מֹשֶׁה אֶל־הָעָם וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם׃ ס

Targ. Jonathan, אוכלוסין סגיין (ὄχλος), "a great number of people."

22. Difficult is here the introduction of the *priests*, כהנים, as only in xxviii. 1, the sons of Aaron are appointed to priestly functions. Therefore, many Jewish interpreters, as Ebn Ezra, Rashi, Rashbam, and others, have taken כהנים, here, as the *first-born*, who are, according to xiii. 2, particularly holy, and consecrated to God, and in whose place, only later, the Levites were chosen as the peculiar priestly tribe (Numb. viii. 14). But, in xxiv. 5., young men are also mentioned, charged to perform sacrifices, and they exercised, therefore, sacerdotal functions, whether they were from the family of Aaron or not. Worthy of consideration is the opinion of Vater, that, as no doubt the prohibition not to approach the mountain was in power for the whole time of the legislation, it included the priests here also, as they were appointed during that time (xxviii. 1. *et seq.*). The priests are then commanded, like the people, to keep themselves holy, that is, not to come near the mountain of God, "lest the Lord break forth upon them" (יפרץ), that is, as Targ. Onkelos translates, "lest He kill them" (יקטל). In this verse, as in ver. 24, the priests are, in all respects, subjected to the same regulations as the people, and enjoy no preference whatever over the latter. Philo already deduces, from this circumstance, the perfect equality of all men before God, which principle he finds particularly in every injunction of the decalogue. Moses and Aaron alone are the special servants of the deity, and the mediators between Him and His people.

23. About the form הַעֵדֹתָה, instead of

CHAPTER XX.

Summary.—The Ten Commandments are proclaimed by God. The people terrified by the fearful majesty of the divine presence, wishes in future to receive the precepts of God through the mediation of Moses. He explains to them the reason, why God had this time manifested Himself in such glory and splendour. Then Moses ascends the mountain again, and receives from God the individual laws, which constitute the "Book of the Covenant" (see on xxi. 1—11).

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS. Ver. 1—14.

General Remarks.

The first fourteen verses contain the primary basis of revelation and the fundamental laws of the whole Mosaic legislation. They have, therefore, become the starting-point of all religious systems and of all true civilization, and from their promulgation only dates the diffusion of a genuine monotheism, a purely internal morality and a sound enlightenment. They form a decisive epoch in the history of the human race, and are, therefore, perhaps the greatest and most important event in universal history. In a simple and condensed, yet extremely emphatical form, equally impressive for every degree and manner of intellectual culture, a complete system of duties is

many of them perish. 22. And let the priests also, who come near the Lord, sanctify themselves, lest the Lord break forth upon them. 23. And Moses said to the Lord, The people cannot come up to Mount Sinai, for Thou hast warned us, saying, Set bounds about the mountain, and sanctify it. 24. And the Lord said to him, Go, descend, and come up again, thou and Aaron with thee: but let not the priests and the people break through to come up to the Lord, lest He break forth upon them. 25. So Moses went down to the people, and spoke to them.

הַעֵידֹתָ (2nd person Hiphil of עוּד, the chirek being changed into zere), see *Ewald's* Grammar, § 363. In Deut. iv. 26, occurs the form הַעִידֹתִי.

24. The reverential and modest distance at which the people should keep themselves from the mountain, was considered so important, that Moses was commanded to warn them, once more, not to approach it during the divine manifestation, beyond the fixed boundary, if they wished to escape a certain death.

25. *And spoke to them* (ויאמר אליהם) "this warning" (*Rashi*); thus, as an absolute verb, is ויאמר also used in Gen. iv. 8. (ויאמר קין אל הבל אחיו), and ויגד, in Gen. ix. 22 (ויגד לשני אחיו). From ver. 24, it appears that, after Moses had exhorted the people once more, he ascended the mountain with Aaron, and remained there whilst God proclaimed the Ten Commandments; then he returned to the people, who asked him henceforth to speak to them himself, for they feared the awfulness of the divine visions (xx. 16; Deut. v. 20—24); upon which Moses ascended the mountain again (ver. 18), and received the further ordinances (xx. 18; Deut. v. 28); but the people remained, during this time, quietly in their tents (Deut. v. 27). When then Moses returned from the mountain, he communicated the laws to the people (xxiv. 3), after, however, having received the command from God, to appear again with Aaron, his two eldest sons, and the seventy elders of Israel (xxiv. 1). Thus, all parts of the sacred narrative stand in harmony and logical connection (see also on xxiv. 1).

---

comprised, which man owes to his Creator and his fellow-men; and so comprehensive is the purport of these words, that already from the earliest times the whole sum of the divine precepts has been considered to be included in them as in an embryo, so that all the other laws are only to be regarded as the development or detailed elaboration of these words, wherefore they are by Hebrew tradition justly called the יסודי הדת, the "fundamentals of the faith" (compare *Philo*, Dec., p. 766, *et seq.*; *Cusari*, i. 87: "the Ten Commandments are the pillars of the Law and its roots"; *Rashi* on xxiv. 12; *Abarbanel* on this chapter; *Spencer*, De Legg. Ritt. i. 4). It may even be asserted, that the ritual observances are nothing but a visible embodiment of the general truths here pronounced, and that the civil and political institutions coincide, in their meaning and essence, with the moral axioms here enjoined.—However, the attempts really to deduce from these doctrines all the various precepts and prohibitions of the Pentateuch, must naturally lead to very forced and artificial results, as the subordination of the individual laws under the fundamental precepts is frequently very difficult; the latter are only intended to indicate the spirit in which the legislation is conceived, and the intellectual direction, which it would take in its future development. They

are, then, to be considered as the basis of the *theocracy;* and we shall, therefore, be obliged to examine the Ten Commandments under a twofold point of view; 1st. In what manner they affect the *supremacy of God;* and 2nd. How far they concern the existence and safety of the *political* community.

As a *system* they might briefly be thus delineated. Naturally and simply our duties are divided in those towards *God,* those towards our *fellow-men,* and those towards *ourselves;* but the latter are necessarily excluded from a system of laws, intended only to enforce the first general conditions of theocratical aud political life. Now, the basis and foundation of theocracy is the unconditional belief in the *existence* of God, with the utter exclusion of every other deity; for God is the invisible king of the country. (*First Commandment*).—But an uncivilized nation may hardly be able to conceive and to worship God as a pure *spirit;* and may, therefore, easily incline to represent to itself some corporeal form of God, by which, however, His innermost nature would be destroyed. It was, therefore, necessary severely to prohibit every visible image of God. (*Second Commandment*).—Not less would the profanation of His name gradually produce indifference to His attributes and derogation of His holy essence; and therefore the *sanctity* of His name was strictly to be enjoined. (*Third Commandment*).—For the practical inurement to these difficult doctrines, incessant instruction and edification were required; and this could only be effectually obtained on a *day of perfect rest.* (*Fourth Commandment*).—Thus is, in fact, the First Commandment the only and principal precept of the worship of God, while the three following injunctions are but auxiliary measures to secure and to strengthen its observance.—Here the first tablet might have concluded; but precisely in the midst between the divine and human duties, stand the *filial* obligations; for the parents share, in many respects, the divine authority (see *infra*). Therefore is the Fifth Commandment very properly the centre of all the others; for upwards it is the point of departure for the divine, and downwards for the human duties.

But our offences against our fellow-men consist—1st, in a violation *by deed;* 2nd, *by word;* or 3rd, *by thought.* Now the deed may be directed *a*) against the *person,* or *b*) against the *property* of the neighbour. Therefore the *Sixth Commandment* prohibits *murder,* and the *Eighth, theft.* Between person and property, and constituting a higher holy possession, stands the wedded wife, and therefore the *Seventh Commandment* interdicts *adultery.* Further, the violation by *word* is treated in the *Ninth Commandment,* which denounces *the false witness;* and by *thought,* in the *Tenth,* the coveting of the property of others—and thus the whole system of the *social* duties is perfectly completed; and the conscientious observance of the decalogue sufficed, therefore, to secure the permanency of the spiritual and civil common-wealth.—We might discover in the precepts of the first tablet the same trichotomy of deed, word, and thought, although in a reversed order; namely, the First and Second Commandments enjoin obviously the divine veneration with the heart, the third with the word and the fourth with the deed; and so the decalogue begins with the heart and ends with the heart; for this is the only source of our actions and our thoughts; as, on the other hand, all our actions and all our thoughts redound to the heart and stamp it with their impress,—there is an eternal reciprocality between our feeling, thinking and acting.

As the decalogue contains only the outlines of the legislation, and, according to Rabbinical explanation, even those laws only, the transgression of which was punished with death, it will be sufficient, in the following remarks, merely to point out the general character of these precepts with regard to the two considerations above mentioned, reserving the more detailed expositions for future occasions (see the laws about *murder,* on xxi. 12—14; *adultery,* on xxii. 15, 16; *theft,* on xxi. 37; *legal witnesses,* on xxiii. 1—3).

The contents of the first fourteen verses of our chapter are, in several passages of

the Pentateuch, designated the "ten words" (עשרת הדברים, xxxiv.28; Deut. iv. 13; x. 4; in the Talmud, עשרת הדברות), and have, therefore, been called by *Philo*, Josephus, and others, *Δεκάλογος*, *Decalogue* (Sept. *οἱ δέκα λόγοι*, and *τὰ δέκα ῥήματα*). But nowhere is a clue given as to the division of those verses into the "ten words." Therefore, a variety of opinions prevailed on this subject from early times; they may, however, now be reduced to the following three views: 1. According to the Talmud, Targum Jonathan, Ebn Ezra, Maimonides, Peter Martyr, and others, ver. 2 contains the first commandment; vers. 3—6, the second; ver. 7, the third; vers. 8—11, the fourth; ver. 12, the fifth; ver. 13, the sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth; and ver. 14, the tenth. But, against this division militates the circumstance, that, according to one Masoretic accentuation (see *infra*), ver. 2 (עבדים) concludes only with an Athnach, and must, therefore, be connected with ver. 3 to פני; besides, polytheism and image-worship are two distinct subjects, and cannot be combined in one precept. 2. Others do not admit that ver. 2 is a commandment, as it simply asserts, that God, who now reveals Himself, has released the Israelites from Egypt; they consider, therefore, this verse merely as an introduction, and believe ver. 3 to be the first commandment; vers. 4—6, the second; and then, farther, as specified above. Thus Origen, Jerome, Pseudo-Ambrose, and the Reformed Churches (Calvin, Pseudo-Athanasius, etc., etc.), except the Lutheran. But ver. 2 evidently belongs to the decalogue; and we shall, in its due place, prove that the simple form of an assertion, in which it is worded, cannot exclude it therefrom. 3. Luther, Pfeiffer, and others, take vers. 2—6 together as *one* commandment; but, in order to gain the number ten, they divide ver. 14 into two commandments: *a.* Thou shalt not covet the house of thy neighbour; *b.* the remaining words of the verse. This is also the Masoretic division in Exodus. But it is unquestionable, that ver. 14 forms one commandment, as the house of the neighbour belongs quite as much to the individual enumeration of the forbidden objects, as his wife, his servant, or his cattle. Therefore, the opinion of those deserves scarcely to be mentioned, who, with regard to Deuteronomy v. 18, take the words: "thou shalt not covet the wife of thy neighbour," as the ninth commandment, and the other words of the verse as the tenth precept. So Augustin, Bede, and Peter Lombard. About the difference of the wording of the decalogue in Exodus and Deuteronomy, see *infra*. If we carefully examine the contents of these verses, we arrive at the conclusion, that the division of Origen is the most suitable and most logical; but, with the necessary modification, that the *second and third* verses form the first commandment. This division is already adopted by Josephus (Antiq. III. v. 5), who writes: "The first commandment teaches us, that there is but one God, and that we ought to worship Him only; the second commands us not to make the image of any living thing to worship it." The objection, which Ebn Ezra and others after him have raised against the separation of the third and fourth verse, namely, that polytheism and worship of images are identical, does not appear tenable; for it is not impossible for a people to believe in one omnipotent God, and yet to make images of Him. (Compare, about the division of the Ten Commandments in general, *Sonntag*, Studien und Kritiken, 1837, 1 fasc.; *Meyer*, The original form of the Decalogue, p. 17).

These "ten words" were, after the testimony of the Pentateuch itself, written on two stone tablets, which were called "the two tablets of the covenant" (שני לוחות הברית, Deut. iv. 13; iv. 9, 11), and which were preserved in the "ark of the covenant" (ארון ברית, Deut. x. 8), as the decalogue itself was called "the words of the covenant" (דברי הברית, Deut. ix. 13; compare xxviii. 69). How many commandments stood on either of the tablets is again uncertain. Both Origen and Augustin commence the second table with verse 12; so that, according to Origen, the first tablet contains four commandments, and the second, six; according to Augustin, the first, three, the second, seven. But more probable is the ancient division of Josephus and

Philo, who place five commandments on either tablet (*δύο πεμπάδες*), so that the second begins with verse 13. And, as both sides were written upon (xxxii. 15), Josephus asserts, that two and a half were contained on each side; which is, however, problematical, as we cannot well suppose that the words לֹא תִגְנֹב, forming the eighth commandment, were separated. (See *Joseph.*, Antiq. III. v. 8; vi. 5). Thus the first tablet comprises our duties towards God; the second, our obligations towards our fellow-men; but so that the fifth commandment—the veneration of the parents—forms the transition between both tablets, since the parents are, for the children, on the one hand, inferior to the Deity, on the other hand, more sacred than all the other human beings; they are, as it were, the earthly representatives of God; they instruct the children in the fear of God and in virtue, like a heavenly prophet. (Compare *Albo*, Ikkarim iii. 26).

It is worthy of being remarked, that only in the two first commandments God is introduced in the first person, whilst, in the two following verses He is mentioned in the third person. Rabbinical expounders (*Talmud*, Maccoth, 24, *a*) assign, as a reason for this circumstance, that the people were, after the two first commandments, unable to bear the fearfulness of the divine majesty and voice, and that, therefore, Moses communicated to them, later, the following words which he had heard alone. But the holy text states, distinctly, that God revealed to the Israelites, without mediator, the Ten Commandments, amidst fire and thunder (vers. 1, 19; Deut. iv 13, 14). And Ebn Ezra justly remarks, that God speaks, in many passages, of Himself, in the third person (compare xix. 21), and that transitions from the first person into the third are not unfrequent.

The decalogue has, it is remarkable to observe, a double accentuation, the one with regard to the end of the commandments, the other with reference to the division of the verses. (They are called טעם עליון, and טעם תחתון, upper and lower accent). Where only one accent stands, it must be supposed that both coincide. From this double accentuation, the twofold vowels of some syllables are explicable, for instance, פָּנָֽי (ver. 3), the Kametz beneath the נ, on account of the Soph-Pasuk, and the Pathach, on account of the Rebia; similarly, תִּרְצָֽח, the Pathach, on account of the Tipchah, the Kametz, on account of the Silluk. That circumstance serves further to explain why תִּֿרצח. has a Dagesh lene in the ת, and yet a Raphe above it; for the preceding word, לֹא, has two accents, the separating Tipchah, which causes the Dagesh lene in the following ת, and the connecting Merka, which leaves the ת as an aspirate. Compare also, לֹא תִּֿנאף; לֹא תִּֿגנב (ver. 13); ועָשִׂיתָ כָּל (ver. 9).

כ 1 וַיְדַבֵּר אֱלֹהִים אֵת כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה לֵאמֹר׃ ס 2 אָנֹכִי

FIRST TABLE.

The First Commandment.—The Existence and Unity of God (Vers. 2, 3).

The disobedience of the people of Israel had already, in the few trials which they had suffered, displayed itself on more than one occasion. If it was, therefore, intended to procure for the laws of Moses the least access to the minds of the people, it was of primary importance to counteract, and, if possible, to eradicate their disbelief. To effect this great end, the words were proclaimed: "I am the Lord thy God, who have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." This was an event which they all had experienced and witnessed, in which they all had obviously seen God's power, wisdom and providence, and which had powerfully manifested to them His omnipotence and His justice. In this respect, that verse constitutes, as it were, the ***historical basis*** of the legislation, the positive foundation on which the great edifice of the legislative system of Moses was erected. Ancient Jewish philosophers already have raised the ques-

It is known that the decalogue, in its repetition in Deuteronomy (v. 6—18), contains, from the third commandment, several more or less important deviations, a subject which is not without peculiar difficulties, but the full elucidation of which is more in its proper place in the quoted section of Deuteronomy. Here we remark only, that a careful consideration of the matter leads to the following conclusions: 1st. The difference of the *words* in both decalogues is perfectly unessential, as they cause, in no instance, a difference of the *sense*: 2nd, the wording in Exodus is the original one, as it was revealed to Moses, and engraved on the tablets of the covenant: 3rd, the Book of Deuteronomy contains only a brief historical sketch of events, already related before with more elaborate detail; and the general sense only, not the exact words of the previous narrative must be expected: thus we can easily account for the difference of the decalogue in Deuteronomy, which, in fact, refers twice to the former version in Exodus ("as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee," vers. 12 and 16).

As we stand here at the entrance of the whole legislation, we deem it expedient to premise the following remarks of the great Ebn Ezra, as they concisely embody the principles which have guided us in the exposition of the Mosaic laws: "Know that all commandments can be considered under one of the following two points of view. The first class comprises such laws as are by God implanted in the heart of every man of sound judgment; they are very numerous, and in the decalogue it is only the precept concerning the Sabbath which is not suggested by reason alone. Therefore, all intelligent persons, of all nations, admit and practise those laws; and it is impossible to increase or to diminish them; even Abraham had already, besides others, observed them. *And God has given the Law to men of intelligence only, and those who have no intelligence have no Law* (ומי שאין לו דעת אין לו תורה). The second class contains the precepts, which are obscure to us, and the reasons of which are not explained in the Law. Far, far be from us the thought, that there can exist a single law in opposition to reason; but if a precept seems to us irreconcilable with our understanding, we must, nevertheless, faithfully observe it; it is, however, our duty, not to accept it blindly, but to search in the writings of the sages after its reason, whether it is, perhaps, to be understood in a figurative sense; and if we find there no satisfactory information, we must reflect and study ourselves to find an explanation; but if we can, in spite of our anxious researches, not find any clue, then only let us drop the matter, and acknowledge that we do not understand it."

CHAP. XX. 1. And God spoke all these words, saying,
2. I *am* the Lord thy God, who have brought thee out of

tion, why God did not rather designate Himself here by the majestic title of Creator of Heaven and Earth. This query was, for instance, addressed by Rabbi Jehudah Halevi, the celebrated author of the book Cusari, to Ebn Ezra, who answers, in a somewhat mystical manner, that in the *accelerated* redemption of Israel from Egypt, which would, after the constellation of the stars, have taken place much later, the love of God for His people manifested itself most distinctly; but remarks, also, that the ways by which men acquire knowledge, are very different according to the degree of their intellectual faculties, and that, therefore, Israel, which was then only in the infancy of its spiritual development, would hardly have understood, with equal clearness, so abstract a notion as that of the Lord of the Universe, whereas, that of the Deliverer from Egypt, must have been intelligible and palpable to all (compare Cusari, i. 25; and *Ebn Ezra*, on ver. 2). Besides, the release from Egypt obliged Israel to accept the whole Law, whilst the creation would have pointed only to a religion of nature, incumbent upon all

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים׃
3 לֹא־יִהְיֶה לְךָ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים עַל־פָּנָי׃ 4 לֹא־תַעֲשֶׂה־לְךָ
פֶסֶל ׀ וְכָל־תְּמוּנָה אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׁמַיִם ׀ מִמַּעַל וַאֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ מִתָּחַת

men. Further, the Mosaic legislation required a sound fundamental principle, calculated to pervade it, and to combine all its parts by a bond of unity; and that principle is only and exclusively the existence of one eternal almighty God, who protects Israel — and therefore again must the legislation begin with our words. But as the doctrine of monotheism is a spiritual and moral axiom, innate in the heart of man, and inseparable from human nature—which is, in fact, the case with all the Ten Commandments, with the only exception, perhaps, of the fourth (see *supra*)—it was not necessary to express it in the form of a command; the people were, at the beginning of the legislation, merely once more, with emphasis, *reminded* of that doctrine, in order to be the better enabled to follow the law-giver in his further injunctions. In a similar manner the simple affirmation of our verse has already been explained by Nachmanides, in that celebrated dissertation which he held in the year 1263, before the king James of Arragon, in Saragossa, against Fra Paolo (see p. 14, ed. Jellinek, Leipz. 1853). Besides, it is nowhere intimated that this first revelation contained just precepts and prohibitions; they are not called in the Pentateuch מצות, but simply דברים, words, or truths; and *truths* are as essential as commands, as they are the *sources* of our duties. Further, it is extremely easy to convert an assertion into a command, and in our verse the precept is naturally implied: "Believe, with an unshaken assurance, in the existence and providence of the God, who has led thee out of the land of servitude." And, indeed, does the *Halachah* enumerate this sentence as the 25th of the 613 precepts (לידע שיש שם אלוה). But every doubt disappears if we take the third verse also to the first commandment, as has been demonstrated above. Thus, the decalogue contains really *ten* commandments, not *nine*, as has been asserted even by some modern interpreters.—As everything in this compendium of revelation is significant, so at the very beginning, the use of the holiest and sublimest name of the deity (יהוה), which had been communicated and explained to the people through Moses (see note on vi. 2), of that God who had, by the redemption from Egypt, verified Himself as the Unchangeable and Eternal (compare, about the original *Hebrew* character of this name, note on iii. 14). The tenor of the second verse may, further, as some believe, involve the idea, that not only His grandeur and omnipotence ought to lead the Israelite to worship Him, but also the duty of gratitude which they owe to Him as their rescuer and patron. (Compare about the expression אלהי ישראל, *Wesseli*, רוח חן, on the Book of Wisdom, xv. 1, and גן נעול, x. 2.) Less unforced appears the inference of Salvador and others, that by alluding to the redemption "from the house of slaves" the idea of *personal freedom* is here proclaimed as the supreme political principle (see note on xix. 6).—It follows, as a simple and natural consequence of the worship of the God of Israel, who was even to the ancestors, already known as Creator of Heaven and Earth, who fills the universe with His glory, that besides Him no other deity can exist, that, therefore, all beings which are adored by other nations are *nonentities* (אלילים). Thus the second and third verse are closely connected, as the Masora has already indicated by Athnach under עבדים. The Israelites are warned not to follow the perverse custom of the heathens, who worshipped, besides their principal deity, the gods of other nations also, in order to propitiate

the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. 3. Thou
shalt have no other gods besides me.—4. Thou shalt not
make to thee any graven image, or any likeness *of any
thing* that *is* in heaven above, or that *is* in the earth

these also for themselves.—אלהים אחרים, other gods, which plural is *preceded* by the verb יהיה, in the singular, as frequently; see iv. 29; vii. 10, etc. Onkelos, less appropriately: "another god," and Rosenmüller also takes here אלהים, as the pluralis majestatis.—על־פני, "*besides me*"; Onkelos, בר מני, "except me"; in ver. 20, אתי; compare Numb. iii. 4; in xxii. 19, בלתי יי׳ לבדו; Septuagint, πλὴν ἐμοῦ; Vulgate, "coram me," all which translations nearly coincide in sense. This prohibition not to serve any deity besides God, is in different passages, directed against Sabæism, or worship of celestial orbs (Deut. iv. 19); the *Maskith stones* (Lev. xxv. 1); the gods of the heathen nations (Exod. xxiii. 24, etc); their very names were not to be mentioned (Exod. xxiii. 13); their altars, sacred groves and statues in Palestine were to be destroyed and burnt (Exod. xxiii. 24; xxxiv. 13, etc.); the precious metals of which the idols were made are cursed, and, therefore, not to be taken as a possession (Deut. vii. 25, 26); the seven nations of Canaan, who might seduce the Israelites to idolatry, were to be extirpated (Deut. vii. 1); no alliance, no intermarriage with them was to be suffered, since they do everything which is an abomination to the Lord, and even burn their sons and daughters in honour of their gods (Exod. xxxiv. 15, 16; Deut. xii. 29—31, etc.).—And as ver. 3 is a command in its *form* (לא יהיה), so is ver. 2, in its *contents*. Thus, the third verse adds to the idea an exceedingly important notion: *the unity* of God. The worship of nature, and every other kind of idolatry, necessarily divide the power and perfection of the deity in many parts, as each of the heathen gods has only one limited sphere of action allotted to him, and the afflicted heart of the sufferer turned doubtingly now to this deity, now to another, uncertain "whence the help should come for him." But as the God of Israel excludes all other deities besides Himself, who is omnipotent and omniscient; He fills alone the human mind, and moves it with unlimited love and adoration; and thus already the first command involves the highest and greatest of all principles of our duties towards God: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might" (Deut. vi. 5); for that love shall not be divided, but concentrated into one powerful and kindling focus. It follows naturally from the theocratical character of the decalogue, that the violation of this commandment, the worship of any other deity besides the God of Israel, is a crime, to be punished with death (see on xxii. 19; compare Deut. xvii. 2—7). The same rigorous punishment falls even upon those who try to persuade others, be they even their nearest relatives, to forsake the God of Israel (Deut. xiii. 7—12); and a Hebrew city which has openly professed to serve other gods, is entirely to be burnt, both its inhabitants, and its property (Deut. xiii. 13—18), which law has, however, been mitigated by Rabbinical interpretation (Sanhedrin, x. 4; vii. 10).

Second Commandment.—Interdiction of Images and Idols. Incorporeality of God. Vers. 4—6.

Not only should the God of the redemption from Egypt, and He only be believed, His adoration should also be perfectly spiritual, for He is a spirit Himself; every corporeality should be banished, because He also is incorporeal, not to be represented with the external senses, but to be conceived with the soul

וַאֲשֶׁר בַּמַּיִם מִתַּחַת לָאָרֶץ׃ 5 לֹא־תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לָהֶם וְלֹא

xii. 8)." The logical gradation in פסל and תמונה shows, that we must take the latter expression here in the second sense as a conception of the imagination.—The text then specifies the objects, the representation of which for idolatrous purposes is interdicted; but they are contained still more distinctly in the following verses (Deut. iv. 15—19): "Take therefore good heed to yourselves; for you saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spoke to you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire: Lest you corrupt yourselves, and make to yourselves a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female; the likeness of any beast that is on the earth, the likeness of any winged fowl that flieth in the air; the likeness of anything that creepeth on the ground, the likeness of any fish that is in the waters beneath the earth: And lest thou lift up thy eyes to heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldst be driven to worship them, and serve them, whom the Lord thy God hath divided to all nations under the whole heaven." All the different manners of idolatry here enumerated, were really and extensively practised in the land, which the Israelites had just quitted, and the religious perversities of which they had adopted; and Philo observes in this respect (Decal. xvi): "The Egyptians, besides falling down to statues and images, have also introduced irrational animals, to the honours due to the gods, such as bulls, and rams, and goats, inventing some prodigious fiction with regard to each of them; and as to these particular animals they have indeed some reason for what they do, for they are the most domestic and most useful to life.... But as it is, they go beyond these animals, and select the most fierce and untameable of all wild animals, honouring lions and crocodiles, and of reptiles the poisonous asp, with temples, and sacred precincts, and sacrifices, and assemblies, and solemn processions, and by similar means. For

and felt with the heart. The Israelites had during the revelation only heard a voice, but seen no figure (see note on xix. 6), lest they be tempted to impute to Him material qualities. Even images of the Eternal must soon lead to erroneous notions about His attributes, and thus, by a natural concatenation, to idolatrous worship; and therefore the second commandment prohibits every representation of any object whatever for religious purposes most severely; and the subsequent history of Israel teaches us, that even the worship of the golden calf, although it was intended as a symbol of God, was punished with the most fearful chastisement (see xxxii. 26—29).—From the same reason, the image of the Danites, although it was intended for the worship of the God of Israel, and the two golden calves of Jeroboam, were against the injunction of our commandment, and affected the very groundwork of the Mosaic law (Judges xviii. 30, compared with xvii. 13; 1 Kings xii. 28). The Israelites were, then, forbidden to make a פֶּסֶל, which designates the general notion of *image* (from the verb פסל, to cut, to carve). But not only such a gross idol (*εἴδωλον*, Sept.) was forbidden, but also every תמונה, figure or form, which the mind shapes to itself easily and freely, wherefore תמונה is in Matt. xxxvii. 3, explained by *ἰδέα*, *idea*, and here rendered by the Septuag. with *ὁμοίωμα*, *similitude*. That word is the most clearly interpreted by Maimonides (Moreh Neb. i. 3): "The word תמונה is used in three different manners. It denotes, namely, 1. The external, visible, objective quality or shape of a thing (compare Deut. iv. 15, 16). 2. The form or image of a thing, which the human imagination keeps alive, after the object itself has been withdrawn from the senses (compare Job iv. 13); and 3. The characteristic quality of a thing, as it is understood and conceived by the mind; and in this signification it is used with respect to God also (Num.

beneath, or that *is* in the water under the earth: 5. Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor [1]be induced to serve

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Serve them.

searching in the earth and in the water, which two elements are given by God to man for his use and advantage, after the most fearful animals, they found among the land-animals nothing more savage than the lion, and among the aquatic animals nothing more fierce than the crocodile; and both these animals they honour and worship. But they have also deified many other animals, as the dogs, cats, and wolves; and among the birds, the ibises and the hawk" (see supplementary note to ii. 10, and note to viii. 22; compare *Tacitus*, Hist. v. 5).

It may perhaps be admitted, that the prohibition expressed in our verse has exercised a retarding influence upon the progress and development of the plastic arts among the Hebrews, as a similar interdiction of the Koran has produced a similar effect among the Arab tribes: for plastic art, in its beginnings, generally stands in the service of religion, and advances by the stimulus it affords. But it is an incomprehensible mistake, if it is believed that the plastic arts in general, sculpture and painting, are forbidden in our text. (*Joseph.*, Antiq. XV. viii. 1; XVII. v. 2, etc.: the Jews would not even suffer the image of the emperor which was represented on the eagles of the soldiers, *Joseph.*, Antiq. XVIII. iii. 1, etc.; a temple of the Tetrarch Herodes in Tiberius was, by decree of the Sanhedrin, burnt down, merely because it was ornamented with figures of animals, *Joseph.*, Vit. xii.). Such a barbarous and irrational law could not possibly emanate from a legislator, who commanded and erected a holy tent, furnished with all the adornments of art and beauty, who even ordered two cherubim to be placed in the Holy of Holy (xxv. 18—20; compare xxv. 34; xxvi. 32; Num. xxi. 8, 9). In the first temple as well as in the second, was an abundance of plastic works, which nobody has found at variance with the *spirit* of Mosaism. We mention further, the "serpent of brass" which Moses erected (Num. xxi. 9); the golden figures which the Philistines offered for the holy tabernacle (1 Sam. vi. 17); the "molten sea" in the court of the Solomonic temple, which rested on twelve cast oxen (1 Kings, vii. 25); the throne of Solomon, borne and surrounded by fourteen magnificent lions (1 Kings, x. 20). A limited and short-sighted interpretation of the *letter* of the holy text has, in other passages also, led to the most perverse and almost ridiculous results. For the purpose *of religious worship*, no images were to be made; more than this does our text not forbid (compare, however, *Joseph.*, Antiq. XII. iv. 11; XV. ii. 6; XIX. ii. 1). The Talmud, although it forbids representations of human images and of celestial orbs, if they are liable to be regarded as idols, allows expressly images of animals, etc., as ornaments (Ab. Sar. 43 a.; *Maim.* Ab. Sar. iii. 10, 11).—The water is described as "under the earth," because the beds of the rivers and seas lie lower than the coasts and shores.—In the shorter catechism both of the Lutherans and of the Roman Catholics, the fourth verse is omitted; and it has been asserted that the latter did so from obvious dogmatical motives.

Since idolatry would infect the very root of the new doctrines, and thus undermine the whole stem of the Mosaic legislation; and since it is, by a necessary connection, the beginning of the mental, religious, and political decline of the country (see Lev. xviii. 28; Deut. iv. 25—31); it is forbidden with an intensity applied in no other passage of the Pentateuch, and with reference to no other law. Not only is one of the awful curses pronounced from Mount Ebal directed against him who secretly worships any image, an abomination to the Lord (Deut. xxvii. 15); it is only with regard to idolatry that God calls Himself אל קנא a zealous God, who suffers no other

תַעָבְדֵ֑ם כִּ֣י אָנֹכִ֞י יְהוָ֤ה אֱלֹהֶ֙יךָ֙ אֵ֣ל קַנָּ֔א פֹּ֠קֵד עֲוֺ֨ן אָבֹ֧ת עַל־בָּנִ֛ים

deities besides Himself; and Maimonides (Moreh, i. 36) observes, that God is only with respect to an idolator called enemy (אויב), adversary (צר), and antagonist (שונא). And in order to deter with still greater force from the abomination of idolatry, a principle is added, which belongs to the obscurest and most difficult of the Mosaic theology: "God visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation, to those who hate Him, and shows mercy to thousands, to those who love Him and keep His commandments." It appears to be in opposition to the divine love and justice, that the children should innocently suffer for the crimes of their fathers; and this principle, if really contained in our words, would be a great defect in the system of the Mosaic ethics. But already the directly opposite declarations in other passages of the Old Testament ought to warn us to be circumspect in the exposition of our text. In Deut. xxiv. 16, we read literally: "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin"; and with a verbal reminiscence from this passage we read in 2 Kings xiv. 5, 6: "And it came to pass, as soon as the kingdom was confirmed in his hand [of Amaziah], that he slew his servants, who had slain the king his father. But the children of the murderers he slew not: according to that which is written in the book of the law of Moses, wherein the Lord commanded, saying, The fathers shall not be put to death for the children," etc. Comp. Ex. xxxii. 33. It is, then, manifest, that our passage must have a similar sense, which, in fact, offers itself unforcedly, if we only refer the word לשנאי "to those who hate me" to the *children*, not to the *fathers*: God visits the sin of the fathers upon the children, if the latter also trespass His precepts; and quite analogously herewith God blesses the virtuous descendants of the pious: and in this sense Targum Onkelos already adds after לשנאי the words: "if the children continue to sin like their fathers" (כד משלמין בניא למחטי בתר אבהתהון); thus also the Talmud (Sanhedrin 26, כשאוחזין מעשי אבתיהם בידיהם). Indeed, if the children see the pernicious consequences of a sin in their father, and yet persevere in it, they suffer justly a severer punishment, as if they had gone astray by a transitory personal aberration. With this interpretation, the whole Bible stands in perfect harmony. In Gen. xviii. 25, Abraham says: "That be far from Thee to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with the wicked; and that the righteous should be as the wicked, that be far from Thee: Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" Not the mere *external* relationship with sinners causes destruction, but the *internal* affinity with them in evil. In Levit. xxvi. 39, 40, God says: "And they who are left of you shall pine away for *their* iniquity (בעונם) in your enemies' lands, and *also* for the iniquity of their fathers *with them* (ואף..אתם) they shall pine away. If they will confess *their* iniquity and the iniquity of their fathers," etc. Then, only if the wickedness of the children *unites* itself with that of the fathers, the former suffer punishment. In the same manner the piety of the fathers alone cannot bring blessings upon the children, unless these walk also in the good paths of their ancestors. The righteousness of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob could not shield the Israelites from difficult trials and great misery.—Jeremiah xxxi. 29, 30, exclaims: "In those days they shall say no more, The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge, but *they shall say:* Every one shall die for his own iniquity; every man that eateth sour grapes, his teeth shall be set on edge." The prophet combats here the same error, into which many interpreters of our passage have fallen, and expects the time, when all would abandon this dangerous absurdity, which perverts the divine

them: for I the Lord thy God *am* a [1]zealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children to the third

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Jealous.

equity into a blind vengeance. From this it is clear, that the same prophet, in xxxii. 18: "Thou showest loving-kindness to thousands, and recompensest the iniquity of the fathers into the bosom of their children after them," speaks only of such descendants, who imitate the sin of their fathers, who are not only the bodily, but also the spiritual heirs of their ancestors, as is obvious from vers. 19, 30, 31.—Still more solemnly than Jeremiah rises Ezekiel against that preposterous maxim, and devotes to this subject an elaborate polemical discussion in the eighteenth chapter of his prophecies; and the result is in vers. 20 to 24, thus condensed: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, nor shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him. But if the wicked will turn from his sins, which he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die. Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God: and not, that he shall return from his ways, and live?" Here is, beyond every misconception, the double principle pronounced: 1. that every one receives the reward of his deeds; and 2. that every sinner, even the children of the impious, if they abandon the bad ways of their fathers, are received by God in love and mercy.—The history of Achan in Joshua vii. cannot be taken into consideration here, as it is an extraordinary case of martial law, which can prove nothing for the usual custom of the people. Martial law is in modern times and countries also very different from the civil law, both in spirit and in practice.—In 2 Sam. xii. 14, not the son of Bathsheba is punished, but David; and the extirpation of the house of Jeroboam (1 Kings xiii. 34; xiv. 10, 17) takes place, because his descendants also were idolators.—Remarkable is the observation of Plutarch (De sera Num. Vind.) which nearly coincides with the doctrine here developed: "If a wicked father begets a virtuous son—as sometimes sickly parents have healthy children—God remits to such a son the punishment which was destined to the race, because he has now as it were, passed over from the family of vice to that of virtue. But if the soul retains the (internal) resemblance with the corrupted family, then he must certainly take upon Himself the punishment of vice also like an inherited debt."

Thus is the principle which our text involves, already from this side, as we believe, perfectly justified; but hereto accedes, that in Exod. xxxiv. 7, and Num. xiv. 18, it is enumerated among the divine attributes of love: "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression, but who will by no means clear the guilty (ונקה לא ינקה), visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children to the third and fourth generation." But it would indeed be no *mercy* on the part of God, to destroy the guiltless children for the iniquities of the fathers; and here offers itself spontaneously the explanation, that the expression ונקה לא ינקה signifies: *he does not root out*, so that the sense would be: God does not clear off the sin at once, but settles (פקד) it gradually within three or four generations; lest the individual, crushed by the weight of the punishments, perish. And this is, indeed, an act of divine mercy!—But the sons to the third or fourth generation can the more bear a part of the guilt, as the blessing of thousand, that is, innumer-

עַל־שִׁלֵּשִׁים וְעַל־רִבֵּעִים לְשֹׂנְאָי׃ 6 וְעֹשֶׂה חֶסֶד לַאֲלָפִים לְאֹהֲבַי

able generations is promised to them, so that this circumstance also is a testimony of the love of God. So far from the truth is the opinion of those, who find in our commandment a proof, that the God of the Old Testament is a God of *revenge*!—Further is the distinction not to be overlooked between the *natural consequences* of many excesses, as prodigality, debauchery, or disreputable conduct of any kind, which are necessarily entailed upon the unhappy children, and the *moral responsibility*, which falls exclusively upon the sinful parents. That principle of natural consequences is especially obvious in the history of whole nations, where civic and domestic virtues secure and strengthen the state for many generations, whilst moral depravation necessarily accelerates its downfall. In Gen. xv. 16, it is clearly stated, that Canaan could not be conquered earlier than in the fourth generation from Abraham; because then only the measure of the sin of its inhabitants was full; whence it follows distinctly: 1. that the annihilation of the Canaanites was merited on account of their wickedness; and 2. that the natural consequence of that immorality was the unavoidable ultimate decay of their political existence. God is the judge of the whole world; and His justice watches over all nations.—Ebn Ezra takes פקד here in the sense of *waiting*: God delays long-sufferingly the punishment to the third and fourth generation, hoping, that the descendants of the sinner will repent; and He then only chastises. But it is not obvious, why the first generations should be entirely free from punishment. — Lastly, Maimonides observes, in the passage above referred to, that the expression: "He visits the iniquity of the father upon the children," applies only to the crime of idolatry and to none else; and thus the operation of that principle is practically limited to a very narrow sphere, and to a sin which, in fact, outweighs all the rest in infatuation, and, especially in a theocratical state, deserves the severest castigation.—The death of the children of the unhappy Naboth proves as little a contrary practice among the Israelites as the exceptional case of Achan above referred to. The deed against the innocent Naboth himself was an atrocious murder committed by the idolatrous and impious Jezebel; her sanguinary measures are severely reproved, and a fearful death ended prematurely her nefarious career (1 Ki. xxi. 7; 2 Ki. ix. 26). About the rigorous punishment threatened for the least approach to idolatry, see on xxii. 17. To sum up the arguments in support of the doctrine of our text, we repeat: 1. It applies only to such children, as follow the sins of their fathers. 2. It is intended as a merciful act of gradual, almost imperceptible punishment during several generations. 3. It is clear in itself as to the natural consequences of many immoral actions; and 4. It applies only to the crime of idolatry.

We shall now briefly state and examine the other principal opinions advanced on this subject. *Grotius* (De Jure Belli et Pacis, ii. p. 593) says: "God threatens, in the Mosaic law, to visit the impiety of the fathers upon the descendants: but He has right and dominion both over our property and our lives." But, by such remarks, our doctrine is not illustrated, but still more veiled; and thus would happiness and misery, life and death, be torn from every connection with the human actions. (Compare the similar reason, advanced by others, on iii. 22).—*Michaelis* (Mos. R. v. § 229) believes, that the punishment, alluded to in our text, is the *leprosy*, which generally propagates itself to the third and fourth generation. But it would not only have been strange to threaten such natural extension of a bodily evil as a peculiar divine punishment, but that disease is a calamity by which the children of the *good*, and the virtuous children of the wicked, are equally visited. The same writer remarks, in his commentary on

and fourth *generation*, to those who hate me; 6. And showing mercy to thousands, to those who love me, and

our passage, that here temporal evils only are alluded to: "In this manner the children, on whom God visits the sin of the fathers, suffer no wrong, and yet do the fathers feel pangs. For temporal bliss or woe are not always dispensed by Providence according to merit; and if the children fear God, the evil inflicted upon them will be to them a means of moral correction; but, if they follow their wicked father, it befalls them as a well-merited punishment." But temporal evils, as disease, pain, and misfortune, are, at least after the notions of the ancients, chastisements, since the reward also consists mostly of temporal blessings, long life, a good and numerous progeny, and the like.—According to *Rosenmüller*, our maxim has its origin in the practice of Oriental princes, who often order the extermination of the whole family of the aggressor. It is true, that we have many and authentic instances of such usage; thus says *Cicero* (ad Brut. Ep. 15): "Herein lies the cruelty, that the children, who have committed nothing, must bear the punishment. But that is a custom both ancient and common to all nations," and he adds, as its reason, "that the love to their children might make the parents more anxious for the interests of the state." *Thevenot* (Trav. vi. p. 577) writes, concerning the pearl-fisheries of Persia: "All pearls, which weigh half a medical or more, belong to the king, and the fisher who brings them receives a rich present. But if a fisher embezzles pearls, and sells them into other countries, the king, if he is informed of it, punishes with death the whole family and the relatives of the fisher, men and women, even to the *seventh degree*." Plato, Alexander the Great, and Seneca, strongly denounce this barbarous custom, which, however, had taken too deep root in ancient states. (See *Curtius*, vi. 11, 20; *Potter*, i. 346; ii. 617; *Rosenm.*, Orient. ii. pp. 60, 61). But after the arguments above adduced, which prove that the "visiting of the sin of the fathers upon the children" is a *mercy* of God, who wishes to rescue even the fathers from entire destruction, in order, no doubt, to leave them an opportunity of repenting, we cannot, in the remotest sense, think of an annihilation both of ancestors and descendants. — The foregoing remarks imply, further, a sufficient refutation of Warburton's opinion, that the principle of the punishment of the children for the transgressions of the fathers had but temporarily been laid down in the Pentateuch, for the uncivilized people, as a surrogate for the doctrine of immortality; that it was later repealed by Jeremiah (xxxi. 29—33) and Ezekiel (xviiii.); and that this maxim, although cruel and severe in itself, was yet, in that case, not unjust, since it had been willingly acknowledged by the people as a condition of the covenant. But how can we suppose that a prophet should have attempted to abolish or to amend a moral law of Moses, or that Moses should have given an ethic doctrine merely as a temporary substitute, since he proclaimed his laws as eternal and unchangeable? (Deut. iv. 2; xiii. 1; etc.) We must, however, add, that, in the judicial *practice* of the Hebrews, the children were often made bond-servants for the debts of their parents, as was the case among the Greeks and Romans (see *Becker*, Charikles ii. 32). See, especially, 2 Kings iv. 1; compare Isa. l. 1; Nehem. v. 5. But we find no provision of this kind in the Mosaic law, with the spirit of which that hard-hearted custom is in direct opposition.

We conclude this note with a few grammatical remarks. About לא...וכל, in ver. 4: "not...nor any," see note on xii. 16; compare Prov. xii. 21, etc. — מתחת is construed with ל, like all prepositions which are considered as adverbs, as סביב, מנגד, מעבר, etc.—ולא תעבדם, Hophal: you shall not be induced to serve them.—אל קנא, *zealous* God, not *jealous*; Mendels.: "eifervoll"; De Wette·

וּלְשֹׁמְרֵי מִצְוֺתָי׃ ס 7 לֹא תִשָּׂא
אֶת־שֵׁם־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לַשָּׁוְא כִּי לֹא יְנַקֶּה יְהוָה אֵת אֲשֶׁר־יִשָּׂא
אֶת־שְׁמוֹ לַשָּׁוְא׃ פ

"eifriger Gott;" the passion of jealousy can never be attributed to God, before whom all other deities are *nothings* (אלילים). But those who believe that zealousness is a quality unworthy of the God of Love, we refer to Hengstenberg's remarks (Authenticity of the Pent. ii. p. 454—456), where it is proved, that, without energetic zeal, even His love would be questionable, and that the New Testament shares, in this respect, entirely the notions of the Mosaic records (for instance, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον, Hebr. xii. 29; compare the observations of *Calvin*, Inst. ii. 8, 18).—To שלשים, רבעים, and אלפים, must be supplied בנים, which proceeds as the general notion, or דורים.

THIRD COMMANDMENT.—AGAINST PERJURY. HOLINESS OF GOD. VER. 7.

After the existence of God, and His adoration as a Spirit, has been enforced in the two first commandments, follow now appropriately His *holiness* and *sublimity*, which forbid to defile His name by abusing it for an untruth. And, in fact, a false oath, sworn by the name of God, virtually amounts to atheism; and he who violates the third commandment, overthrows at the same time the first. From this point of view, it is accountable why the Rabbins attach such paramount importance to this commandment, that they assert, that the whole world trembled when it was proclaimed (*Talmud*, Sheb. 39 *a*). Even our text points to the extraordinary sacredness of this precept, by adding the warning, that "the Lord will not hold him guiltless who taketh His name for falsehood." This is evidently expressed with emphasis (by way of *litotes*), and means: "that God will persecute perjury with fearful punishment"; it implies also, as Philo observes, that although men do not see the punishment of the false oath, and although its infliction is often long delayed, God never withholds it. And the chastisement for the heinous crime of perjury, which does not only destroy the divine, but also the human right, which undermines the foundations of society, and indicates a total deadening of conscience and morality, is justly left to God Himself, who searches the hearts—so dreadful a sin, which springs up in the corrupt soul of the criminal, cannot be persecuted by human judges: and the same practice prevailed a long time among the Romans. In the further progress of the legislation, two kinds of perjury are specified; namely, the false oath of a witness taken before a tribunal; and the untrue declaration in lieu of an oath, by which it is sought to embezzle property found or received (Lev. v. 1; vi. 2, *et seq.*). For either of those two transgressions, expiation by guilt-offerings is required; in the latter case, accompanied by an increased restitution of the embezzled property (see notes on xxii. 6—12; and xxiii. 4). It was, further, considered as a violation of the sacredness of the oath, if an adjuration was publicly proclaimed by the authorities, in cases when the perpetrator of a crime had remained undiscovered, or could not be legally convicted; and if then the guilty, or those who were able to furnish any information on the matter, did not come forward with a full confession (see Lev. v. 1; Prov. xxix. 24; compare 1 Sam. xiv. 24; Mal. ii. 2). An oath uttered rashly or heedlessly, if sincerely repented with self-consciousness, was atoned by a guilt-offering (Lev. v. 4). We find in the Hebrew text, therefore, two different words for oath, namely, 1., שבועה, the simple oath, either voluntary or administered; and 2., אלה, the adjuration, with added imprecations or curses; and this latter

keep my commandments. 7. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God [1]for falsehood; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless who taketh His name [1]for falsehood.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—In vain.

kind is therefore designated by the compound term, שבועת האלה (Num. v. 21; compare Deut. xxix. 11, 13, 18—12). But the שבועה also may be joined with an imprecation (for instance, Josh. ii. 12, *et seq.*), whence it is explicable that both expressions are sometimes used synonymously (Gen. xxiv. 3, 9; comp. with ver. 41), although אלה is scarcely ever a simple oath without curses.—In the Rabbinical right, the precepts concerning the oath have been enlarged to a complete system; but we may here remark, that it distinguishes likewise chiefly the four kinds of oath to which we have alluded; namely: 1. the heedless oath (שבועת בטוי); 2. the unnecessary, superfluous, or vain oath (שבועת שוא); 3. the oath of witness (שבועת העדות); and 4. the oath in cases of entrusted or found property (שבועת הפקדון). Compare *Mishna*, Shebuoth iii.—v.; viii.; Bab. Kam. ix. 7; *Maim.* Tr. Sheb. vii.—x.—לשוא signifies here, evidently, *for falsehood*; for שוא and שקר are entirely synonymous, as is clear from a comparison of the 13th verse of our chapter with Deut. v. 17; and the Septuagint translates, in both places, μαρτυρία ψευδής. (Compare Ezek. xii. 24; Hos x. 4; xii. 12; Jon. ii. 9). Most of the ancient and modern interpreters understand לשוא here of a *vain, unnecessary* oath. Targum Onkelos translates לשוא in our verse, the first time with למגנא, in vain; and the second time with לשקרא, for falsehood.

But as the decalogue contains only the *fundamental* laws, it is more appropriate to understand here the *perjurious* swearing, nor could the menace of so severe a punishment agree with a merely unnecessary oath; and our verse contains, therefore, what is more distinctly expressed in Levit. xix. 12, לא תשבעו בשמי לשקר: "you shall not swear by my name falsely."—We subjoin, for the further elucidation of our commandment, the following exposition of Ebn Ezra: "It is the law to this day (the twelfth century) in Egypt, if a man swears by the head of the king, and does not keep his oath, he must die, although he might offer his own weight in gold as a ransom, because he has insulted the king publicly. If this is the case with a mortal king, whose beginning is vain, and whose end is vain, and whose government is vain: how many many thousand times more is man bound to guard his tongue, lest it lead him to guilt and to desecration of the name of God.......And we must observe, that we find, in the decalogue, the reward expressly stated only with regard to the veneration of our parents, and the punishment only with respect to idolatry and abusing the name of God to falsehood. And many think, that he who takes the name of God in vain, does not commit a very great sin; but I shall show them that it is more serious than all the other prohibitions which follow. For murder and adultery, although they are most obnoxious crimes, cannot be committed at any time, for fear prevents it; but he who has once accustomed himself to use superfluous oaths, swears, in one day, to an infinite amount, and that habit at last becomes so familiar to him, that he scarcely knows that he swears; and if you reproachfully ask him, why he swore just now, he will swear that he has not sworn; so great is the power of the habit; and, at last, almost his every assertion will be preceded by an oath.......And even if there were, in Israel, but that one sin, it would suffice to protract the dispersion, and to add infliction to our inflictions."—A striking instance of the conscientiousness with which oaths were kept, even in the early history of Israel,

8 זָכוֹר אֶת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת לְקַדְּשׁוֹ׃ 9 שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲבֹד וְעָשִׂיתָ

is recorded in Josh. ix. 15—20.—We need scarcely remark, that all other ancient nations also looked at perjury with horror and abomination, and that the curse of the deity rested on the head of the miserable perjurer; compare, for instance, *Cicero*, De Officiis, iii. 29: "Quod autem affirmate, quasi Deo teste, promiseris, id tenendum est. Jam enim non ad iram deorum quæ nulla est, sed ad justitiam et ad fidem pertinet," in which assertion the divine and the human elements of perjury are combined. Even so far back as the time of Hesiod (between 700 and 800 B. C.), Eris, or Contention, was called the god of oaths; and Polybius states, that among the ancients the use of judicial oaths was rare; but, as perfidy grew, oaths increased. The Egyptians considered perjury as the blackest crime, which was invariably punished with death, since it implied both a contempt for the gods, and a violation of that faith which is the only tie and guarantee for the welfare of society. The Persians refused to swear, but gave their hand as a plight of troth. The Scythians told Alexander the Great: "We swear only by keeping our word." "Hercules," says Plutarch, "was so devout, that he never took an oath." Clinias held adjuration in perfect abhorrence, and the very Greek word, "Epiorkos," signifying perjury, means, literally, the frequent habit of oath-taking. This reluctance to swear at all, even just and judicial oaths, prevailed among the Jews also; the Talmud recommends a simple Yes, Yes, or, No, No, instead of every oath (Sheb. 36, *a*); and the New Testament expresses this idea with peculiar emphasis: "Swear not at all—neither by the heaven, for it is God's throne, nor by the earth, for it is His footstool, but let your communication be Yea, yea, and Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil" (Matt. v. 34—37; James v. 12, with which injunctions Matt. xxvi. 63, 64 does not stand in contradiction); and in accordance herewith oaths were denounced by Justin, Irenæus, Basil, Chrysostom, and Augustine. How deeply this antipathy to swearing was rooted in the minds of the Orientals is shown by the exactly similar proverb of the Arabs: "Never swear, but let thy words be Yes, or No." And, indeed, oath-taking seems to imply, in its principle and origin, that other simple assertions are less sacred or binding, and thus indirectly to exercise an injurious influence upon the moral and religious notions of the people. But swearing by idols or false gods involves their recognition as governing powers, and is, therefore, tantamount to the crime of idolatry (Jer. v. 5; Amos viii. 14, etc.).—About the different forms of oaths, compare Gen. xiv. 22 ("I lift up my hand to the Lord, the Most High God"; see Exod. vi. 8; Deut. xxxii. 40); Gen. xxi. 23, 24 ("Now, therefore, swear to me here, [said Abimelech to Abraham] by God, that thou wilt not deal falsely with me, etc. And Abraham said, I swear!" compare Gen. xlvii. 29—31); Gen. xxiv. 2, 3, 37; xlvii. 29 ("Put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh"); Gen. xxxi. 53 ("And Jacob swore by the fear of his father Isaac"; a heap and a pillar were for a witness of the oath, ver. 52; compare Josh. xxii. 27); Gen. xlii. 15 ("By the life of Pharaoh"; compare the Roman: "Per genium principis," which is, however, a protestation rather than an oath); Deut. xxvi. 17—19 (the form of a mutual agreement); 1 Sam. xiv. 44, etc. ("The Lord do so to me, and more also;" compare our "So help me God"; and "Amen;" see the grand and powerful self-imprecations in Job xxxi; compare Psalm cxx. 3; Numb. v. 21, 22); 2 Kings ii. 2; 1 Sam. xx. 3 ("As the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth"; and, in fact, the name of God seems to have been contained most especially in judicial oaths; compare Levit. xix. 12; Deut. vi. 13, and the words of our commandment); 1 Sam. i. 26; 2 Sam. xi. 11, etc. ("As thy soul liveth"); Jer. xxxviii. 16 ("As the Lord liveth who gave us this soul"; compare especially 1 Kings i. 29, 30); Ezek. xvii. 16 ("As

8. Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. 9. Six

I live, saith the Lord God"); *Josephus*, Bell. Jud. II. xvi. 4 ("I call to witness your sanctuary, and the holy angels of God," etc., which is, likewise, rather an emphatical assertion than an oath).

FOURTH COMMANDMENT.—THE SABBATH. VERS. 8—11.

It was not sufficient to establish the *existence*, the *unity*, and the *holiness* of God in the abstract; the concrete formation and strengthening of these notions in life were the more indispensable among the Israelites, as they were first to be trained to religion and virtue by *practice* and *custom*. However willing their minds, carried away by the grandeur of the events, and of the miracles, might have been, to follow the principles of revelation, they were yet not sufficiently prepared or developed to comprehend them, and, therefore, to adhere to them faithfully for any duration of time. It was, therefore, an arrangement of the highest wisdom periodically to set apart a day, hallowed already since the creation, for purely spiritual occupation, and to endow it, for this purpose, with all attributes of a superior sanctity. Thus was the Sabbath intended to become the great educator of the people; it was destined to imprint *practically* in the hearts of the people the theoretical ideas of Mosaism; it was, after the toilsome materialism of the work-days, to animate them with a sound spiritualism; it did not belong to the external, but to the inner man; it was to be entirely consecrated to the Lord (שבת ליי׳). This admirable and sublime institution, if carried out in the spirit in which it was conceived by the lawgiver, secures for ever to the soul the triumph over the physical being, and gains, for the ideal aspirations, the victory over all worldly vanities; it concludes, therefore, most appropriately, the circle of the duties towards God, which cease, thereby, to be a merely speculative system of theology, to be overthrown and superseded by another ingenious display of words and ideas, but become a perpetual and practical guide of internal morality and virtue, strengthened into a second nature by custom and practice. Now, that the Sabbath may, in truth, perform its mission of elevating the soul to God, and of inducing to the study of His precepts, it is to be devoted to absolute physical rest, shared by the whole people with the strangers, and, to complete the picture of tranquillity, even with the animals. Thus the manifold ends were secured, that the double nature of man, the spiritual and physical, always remained in harmonious equilibrium, that the soul of the afflicted forgot, at least temporarily, its cares and torments, and that even the body, strengthened by rest, was invigorated for the continuance of its labours.

As, therefore, this precept, if scrupulously adhered to, was intended and calculated to ennoble and to beatify man in all his relations, that of the mind, the soul and the body, it is but natural, that both Moses and the prophets and the Rabbins, attach to it a paramount importance. In the Pentateuch (Exod. xxxi. 16, 17) the Sabbath is called an eternal sign or covenant with God, (אות and ברית עולם), and in this sense the observance of the Sabbath is called "an acknowledgment of the deity" (*Cusari*, ii. 50), and its violation "a disavowal of the divine omnipotence as manifested in the creation" (*Rashi*, on Chulin, 5 *a*; and *Ebn Ezra* and *Abarbanel*, on Exod. xxxi. 13); compare the remark of Philo, that the Sabbath is τῆς πρώτης ἀρχῆς ἐκμαγεῖον, ἀπ' ἐκείνης ὥσπερ ἀρχετύπου σφραγῖδος τυποθέν; Nehemiah (ix. 14) mentions the Sabbath alone, of all laws which Moses gave to the Israelites; and the Talmud expressly observes: "the Sabbath is, in importance, equal to the whole law" (שקולה שבת כנגד כל התורה); "he who desecrates the Sabbath openly is like him who transgresses the whole law," whilst "its strict observance suffices to procure for-

כָּל־מְלַאכְתֶּךָ׃ 10 וְיוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שַׁבָּת ׀ לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לֹא־תַעֲשֶׂה

giveness even for idolatry" (Chulin, 5, *a*; Sabb. 118, *b*; compare Isa. lvi. 2, 4, 6; lviii. 3, 13; lxvi. 23; Jer. xvii. 21, *et seq.*; Ezek. xx. 16—20; Hos. ii. 11, etc; Mishna, Chagiga, i. 18); and Maimonides concludes his dissertation on Sabbath with the words: "he who breaks the Sabbath openly is like the worshipper of the stars, and both are like heathens in every respect" (compare Moreh Nebuch. ii. 31; iii. 32, 41, 43). In order, therefore, to invest the Sabbath with the highest possible sanction and holiness, it is instituted as a remembrance of the rest of God, after He had finished, in six days, the work of creation; and this imitation of the divine repose seems, especially, as Philo observes, to be considered as the covenant of Israel with God. Thus had Israel received three signs of covenant: circumcision, the Pesach, and the Sabbath, in which that remarkable progress is visible, that circumcision is the individual and personal sign; the Pesach, the national or specifically Hebrew sign; and Sabbath, the universal sign, which includes the whole human race—whence it has alone, as the highest, found a place among the fundamental doctrines of the decalogue. Further, the circumcision is essentially a ceremonial rite, the Pesach has at least a historical basis, and is connected with the great ideas of independence and political unity, whilst the Sabbath has a perfectly internal and spiritual tendency. Further, the three consecutive signs become relatively more and more intelligible to the human understanding; the circumcision is obscure for us, and hidden in its human origin, and its true end; the character of the Pesach is, at least in some respects, explicable; but the Sabbath "has an existence in the mind itself, and owes its birth to the wants and to the capacities of our moral nature." Lastly, circumcision is a rite performed *once* during the life-time of the Israelite; the Pesach, *annually*; and the Sabbath, *weekly*; whilst the other sacraments, as sacrifices, were practised *daily*. The Sabbath is further distinguished from the two other signs, in this respect, that the foreign slave also, who serves a Hebrew master, enjoys all its privileges of rest and recreation, whilst circumcision is perfectly optional on the part of the servant, and the participation in the Pesach depends on the performance of circumcision (see note on xii. 19).

The decalogue in Deuteronomy (v. 15) assigns another reason for instituting the Sabbath, namely, because God led the Israelites from servitude into liberty, and granted them rest after the labours of a severe bondage. But this does not alter the essence and character of Sabbath. Almost every commandment has a double basis, a *natural* and a *spiritual* one. But the Sabbath received its full significance only by the exode from Egypt, which formed a transition from labour to rest; the Sabbath is, therefore, intended to fill our hearts with that sense of repose and liberty, which must have pervaded the minds of the Israelites in those memorable days. But the fact, that the *creation* is mentioned as the cause of the Sabbath, proves unquestionably, that it is commanded to *all* nations of the earth, not to Israel alone; and it is, at the same time, a convincing argument, that the Saturday, the traditional day among the Jews, is the authentic Sabbath; on which point Luther (Works, iii. p. 643) remarks: "Although the Sabbath has been abolished by the Christians, it is yet necessary to keep one especial day in the week; *nature* also requires both man and beast to abstain from labour, and to rest one day of the week. But he, who wishes to make a *divine* commandment of the Sabbath, as an institution ordained by God, must keep the Saturday, and not the Sunday; for the Saturday has been commanded to the Jews, and not the Sunday." We abide by this decision of the great reformer, and do not deem it expedient here to renew a dispute which has engaged many able pens and has produced many laborious works; those who are accustomed to take large views

days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: 10. But the seventh day *is* the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: *in it*

of religious questions, without preconceptions and without dialectic niceties, cannot for a moment hesitate which course to adopt and which opinion to follow. It suffices to know that the New Testament is most distinct in acknowledging the sanctity of the Sabbath such as it was enjoined by Moses and the prophets, and merely insisting upon its celebration *in its spirit*, without, however, rescinding any of the Sabbatical laws of the divine legislator (Matt. v. 17, 18; xxiii. 23—26; xii. 1—5, 10—12; Luke, xiii. 15; John, v. 9, etc.), whereas the passages in which the abrogation of the Sabbath, or its transfer to the following day has been found, are so obscure that they allow merely inferential proofs without containing direct or conclusive dicta (Col. ii. 16; Acts xv. 28; xx. 6, 7; 1 Corinth. xvi. 1, 2; Rom. xiv. 5; Gal. iv. 10; the expression "Lords' day," occurs only once in Rev. i. 10; and even its original meaning—κυριακὴ ἡμέρα—is doubtful).

As, therefore, he who desecrated the Sabbath intentionally and publicly, and after due warning had been given him, appears to deny or to disdain God as Creator, he was for such profanation not visited with a merely heavenly punishment—כרת—as was the case with the violation of the two other signs, but with the death of lapidation by the earthly judges (xxxi. 14, 15; xxxv. 2; Num. xv. 35, 36); and this severity originated, perhaps, in the idea, that those must be useless, and even dangerous members of society, who, despising the authority of God, do not cultivate with due care, their immortal part, but lose themselves in sordid pursuits of worldly welfare. Those who violated the laws of Sabbath from ignorance or mistake, were obliged to bring a sin-offering (Talm. Sabb. 7 a.). But further, the Sabbath is no isolated institution; it is the foundation of the whole system of the Mosaic festivals; it is the germ of all other sacred days; it includes, as an embryo, the whole cycle of the Sabbath month, the Sabbath year, and the jubilee; therefore he, who disregards the Sabbath, destroys the days of God as a totality, and deserves thus the more justly the severest chastisement (see notes on xxiii. 10—12).

Our commandment prohibits *every labour* (כל־מלאכה) on Sabbath, without specifying the occupations included in that interdiction, but leaving it to the sound judgment of the people to distinguish, which labour would be at variance with the *spirit* of the law, which aims at physical recreation and spiritual elevation, and here also applies the beautiful principle of Ebn Ezra, quoted above (p. 343): "God has given the Law to men of intelligence only, and those who have no intelligence have no Law." The Pentateuch, however, mentions the following kinds of labour as unlawful on Sabbath: 1. The manna should not be gathered; for that was the food for the physical man; and yet not the care for the external wants, but the beneficial influence on the ennoblement of the soul, was the chief purpose of the Sabbath. The meals for the Sabbath were, therefore, to be prepared previously on the sixth day (see note on xvi. 23). About the Sabbath-way (תחום שבת), see note on xvi. 29. 2. No fire should be lighted in the houses (xxxv. 3), perhaps in order to prevent the preparation of meals (Exod. xvi. 23); but certainly still more to render the labour of the mechanics impossible. This appears with sufficient clearness from the connection in which that prohibition is introduced; but both the one and the other would have been *material* occupations. 3. No wood should be gathered (Num. xv. 33—36); for this also was the consequence of worldly anxiety, which might be delayed to the following day. Buying and selling were, of course, as strictly forbidden as carrying burdens (Nehem. x. 32; xiii. 15—19; Jerem. xvii. 21, 22);

כָל־מְלָאכָה אַתָּה וּבִנְךָ וּבִתֶּךָ עַבְדְּךָ וַאֲמָתְךָ וּבְהֶמְתֶּךָ וְגֵרְךָ

agricultural labour was interdicted even in the times of ploughing and of reaping (Exod. xxxiv. 21). As, thus, the legislator has left a wide scope to individual opinion on the nature of Sabbatical labour, tradition, in order to prevent arbitrariness in so important a point, has tried to fill out this void by a detailed definition of the notion of work, and has minutely specified the labours which are allowed, and which are forbidden on Sabbath. The Talmud distinguishes thirty-nine chief labours (אבות מלאכות), comprising all those occupations which were necessary for the construction of the holy tabernacle, and subdivides each of them again into different species (תולדות; see Tract. Sabbath; *Maim.* Hilch. Sabbath, vii. 1; Orach Chajim, ccxlii.—ccccvii.). But in cases of illness, and in any, even the remotest, danger, a deviation from the rigorous precepts of the Sabbath is permitted (Mishna Joma, viii. 6; Sabb. xxiv. 5; Orach Chajim, cccxxviii); and in general, were the principles followed: "The Sabbath is delivered into your hand, not you into the hand of the Sabbath" (השבת מסורה בידכם ולא אתם מסורים בידו; compare Mark ii. 27, 28; Matth. xii. 8), and, "the least danger of life invalidates the Sabbath" (פסק נפשות דוחה שבת, Jom. fol. 83).—Further, all the services of the priests and Levites, even those which require much physical labour, were permitted on Sabbath (אין שבת במקדש). The circumcision also may be performed on Sabbath: additional proofs, that the spiritual elevation of the Israelites was the only end of the institution of Sabbath (compare Mishna Menach. xi. 3; Themur. ii. 1).—It was certainly a misconception of this divine behest, if Jewish armies abstained on Sabbath from the use of arms, and gave themselves up without resistance to be massacred by the enemies (1 Macc. ii. 32, *et seq*; 2 Macc. vi. 11; *Josephus*, Antiq. XII. vi. 2; Bell. Jud. II. xvi. 4); for even according to the severest Rabbinical principles, the use of arms was permitted, since danger of life threatened. Therefore, later judicious and pious generals (as Mathias and Jonathan) have thus modified that practice, that they exercised on Sabbath the defensive, but refrained from the offensive 1 Macc. xi. 34, 43, *et seq.*; *Joseph.*, Antiq. XIII. i. 3; XIV. vi. 2; Bell. Jud. II. xvi. 4). There is, indeed, reason to believe, that the Israelites did, before the exile, not scruple to do military service, and to fight on Sabbath in times of danger, since disadvantages, which a contrary practice would necessarily have entailed upon the Israelites in their perpetual wars, are nowhere mentioned throughout the whole of the Old Testament (compare *Michaelis*, Mos. R. iv., § 196; and the Rabbins enjoin both the defensive and the offensive as a duty if danger threatens; see Orach Chajim, cccxix. 6, 7, 9; *Maimon.*, Jad Hachas. Sabb. ii. 23).

As the Hebrews counted the day from evening to evening, Sabbath commenced on Friday at sunset, and closed at the same time on Saturday. Even Friday already had partly a sacred character, and is in the New Testament called *παρασκευή*, day of preparation (Matth. xxvii. 62, *et seq*). But as the sun disappears earlier in the valleys than in the mountains, commencement and end of the Sabbath were different according to the geographical position of the places. Josephus (Antiq. XVI. vi. 2) mentions, that by a law of the Emperor Augustus, the ninth hour was fixed as the commencement of the Sabbath. In the Jewish towns beginning and conclusion of the Sabbath were, in later times, announced by blowing the tuba (see *Joseph.*, Bell. Jud., IV. ix. 12; *Maim.*, Sabb. c. 5).

The Sabbath was celebrated: 1. by offering double the number of daily sacrifices, by which it should become manifest, that the Sabbath is distinguished above all other days, as the "day of days"; that whilst the other days

thou shalt not do any work, neither thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant,

belong to man, the Sabbath is devoted to God (Num. xxviii. 9). 2. In the Holy of the temple the twelve fresh shew-breads and the incense belonging thereto were placed on the table (Lev. xxiv. 5, 8). 3. The division of the priests, destined for the weekly service, commenced their functions (2 Kings xi. 7, 9). 4. Perfect rest from all physical work was one of the fundamental injunctions (see *supra;* compare xxiii. 12; xxxi. 12, *et seq;* xxxiv. 21, etc.): for God rested, although He created the world merely by His *will*, how much more is rest necessary for man, "whose labour is nothing but toil and vexation." The expression, that God rested, is no anthropomorphism; it does not imply the notion of recreation after exhausting labours; it signifies merely the completion of the works of creation; the return of God to His perfect spirituality, to His unchangeable and eternal providence. 5. This day was especially consecrated to devout occupation with holy thoughts. In earlier periods the people visited the prophets to listen to their instructions and exhortations (2 Kings iv. 23). It was a מקרא קדש, a day of holy assembly; the religious service was, especially in later times, most solemn, and in the synagogues the Law was read to the congregation (*Joseph.*, Antiq. XVI. ii. 4; Ap. i. 22; Luke iv. 16, 31; Acts xiii. 44; xvi. 13; etc.). Even light, thoughtless, every-day conversations were avoided on Sabbath (see *Gesenius* on Is. ii. 230). It was intended to induce the Israelite to reflect on the state of his soul and on the nature of his conduct, and thus to be a day of self-examination, of true repentance, and internal reformation (compare *Cusari* ii. 50; iii. 1). For the Sabbath is *holy*, and the rest of the Sabbath is a *sanctification;* it shall fill the pious man with a part of the holiness of the Creator (compare Exod. xxxi. 13—15; xxxv. 2); and therefore the Sabbath is significantly connected with the number seven, which represents holiness and divine perfection (see note on xxxiii. 10—12). The more incomprehensible is the opinion of those who place the whole weight of the Sabbath in the mere negative element of refraining from labour, without allowing that that great institution implies another positive element, which constitutes its real and more internal character. Freedom from *all* occupation, both physical *and mental and moral* is indolence, and thoughtlessness, and apathy, which cannot possibly, and on any account, produce that sanctification, which is the ulterior aim of all human aspirations. The rest of God is our prototype; but God watches and rules, and is a perfect spirit at all times; to approach Him is, therefore, the end of the Sabbath; mental and moral indifference would remove us from Him; and the Sabbath, instead of being the greatest blessing of mankind, would be its greatest curse.—But 6. it was also a day of recreation, of joy, and of convivial meetings (Is. xlviii. 38; Hos. ii. 13; 1 Macc. 1, 41; Luke xiv. 1). Fasting was expressly forbidden (אסור להתענות ולזעוק ולהתחנן ולבקש רחמים בשבת, *Maimon.* Sabb.).

As far as it was in any way feasible, the Israelites celebrated the Sabbath everywhere, and under whatever dominion, except, perhaps, under the tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanes. "Amidst peril and sorrow, amidst persecution and death, the day of rest was celebrated. In Spain and Portugal, where a public profession of Judaism was punished by exile or death, the Sabbath was still observed. In the secrecy of apartments so dexterously contrived, that they were ignored to the household at large, the Sabbath lamps were lighted, the festive table prepared, wives and mothers, husbands and fathers, gray-haired men and rosy children, assembled in the secluded chamber, and Sabbath hymns were lowly chaunted, and Sabbath prayers were offered up to God, with loud-beating hearts, but whispered voices." And to this observance

אֲשֶׁר בִּשְׁעָרֶיךָ׃ 11 כִּי שֵׁשֶׁת־יָמִים עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם

of the Sabbath especially does the Jewish nation owe the gratifying and auspicious fact, that ignorance never spread among them so far as among many other nations and sects, that every Israelite was, in consequence of the instructions offered to him in the Sabbath discourses, enlightened on the principles of his faith, and that, just in the middle ages, when everywhere the deepest darkness of ignorance and superstition prevailed, immortal philosophers and poets flourished in Israel.

And thy stranger. By the strangers who should also rest, and whom the Israelite is not allowed to employ on that day, we must here understand the second class of those whom we have mentioned in our note on xii. 19, namely, the גרי שער or תושבים; the others, the גרי צדק, are, as a matter of course, included in all the privileges and duties of the Sabbath. But the *beasts* even are ordered to participate in the rest of the seventh day, in accordance with the humane spirit which pervades the Mosaic law in this respect also, and, further, because with the beasts, necessarily men, servants or masters, are obliged to labour (see note on xxiii. 12). It is an ingenious interpretation of the Talmudists, to understand the expression: *God blessed the Sabbath*, so that this day is not included in the divine curse pronounced on the *work*-days, in Gen. iii. 17—19, and that, therefore, by the Sabbath, the paradisiacal blessing is partly restored. Besides, they find in that phrase the intimation, that the rest, on Sabbath, is never injurious to *temporal* prosperity, for God granted, on that account, an increased blessing on the six preceding days, as He gave to the Israelites a double quantity of manna on the sixth day of the week.

We need scarcely go beyond the Pentateuch itself to be convinced that the Sabbath is a purely *Mosaic* institution. In Deut. v. 15, it is brought into connection with the departure from Egypt; in Exod. xvi. 23, it is mentioned with reference to an event which took place only after the exode, and which is, in fact, the first occasion on which it is clearly introduced. We know that it has been asserted that the manner in which the Sabbath is mentioned in the sixteenth chapter, shows that it was, at that time, already familiar to the Israelites. But it is easy to prove that that chapter justifies just the contrary conclusion; for, when the Hebrews gathered, on the sixth day, double the usual quantity, they could not account for it, and enquired, through the elders, of Moses, what that strange incident signified (ver. 22); and Moses answered most explicitly. that the following day is a day of rest, or the Sabbath (vers. 23, 25, 26); but, notwithstanding all this, some of them went out to gather the manna (ver. 27), which would be scarcely explicable on the supposition that the nature of that day was before familiar to the people. Of still less weight is the argument, that we nowhere find a clear and full law concerning the Sabbath, and that, therefore, the Israelites must have been perfectly acquainted with it; for, we believe, that our commandment states the law of Sabbath with perfect distinctness, and renders its character and tendency quite intelligible. The reason that God rested after the sixth day of creation, is intended merely to point to the sacred and momentous character of the Sabbath, but it does not justify the conclusion that it was instituted already immediately after the creation. The Sabbath may have its primary origin in the creation, and might exist, since then, already in the *δύναμις*; but it is clear, that, practically, it could only be introduced after the Israelites had become a nation, independent, autonomous, and free from Egyptian servitude. The commencing words of our commandment: "*Remember* (זכור) the Sabbath-day," can as little be adduced as a proof of its ante-mosaic origin, since they mean only: be always mindful to celebrate that day;

nor thy beast, nor thy stranger who *is* within thy gates.
11. For *in* six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the

and, therefore, in Deut. v. 12, the words "*keep* the Sabbath-day," are used synonymously with those here employed. Many ancient writers state distinctly, that the Sabbath dates from the time of Moses, for instance, Justin Martyr (Dial. con. Tryph. 236, 261); Irenaeus (iv. 30); Tertullian (Adv. Jud. ii. 4).

It has been asserted, that the Sabbath of the Hebrews has been imitated from other Oriental nations, as the Egyptians, Chaldeans or Indians, and it has been traced directly to the worship of Chronos-Saturn, from whom, as is well known, the Romans also called the seventh day *dies Saturni*. The Egyptians, likewise, who were acquainted with the weekly cycles of seven days, are said to have commenced the week with the "day of Chronos" (Dio Cass. xxxvii. 18, 19). As another proof of the adoration of Saturn among the Hebrews, the passage in Amos v. 16, has often been adduced: "You carried the tent of your king, and *the image of your idols* (ואת כיון צלמיכם), the star of your god, whom you have made to yourself"; for כיון has, by many, been falsely understood as *Saturn* (so *Michaelis*, *Bohlen*, and others, but the Vulgate translates: "*imaginem idolorum vestrorum*," and Gesenius adopts this interpretation in his Thesaurus). However, all those analogies are erroneous; for 1st., although the seventh day of the week was called, by the Romans, *dies Saturni*, it was considered as a *dies ater*, an unlucky day, which is in perfect antagonism with the Hebrew Sabbath, and the planet Saturn itself is called stella nocens, sidus triste, or grave Saturni sidus in omne caput; the Arabians designate Saturn as the "great misfortune"; the Chaldeans worshipped him in a black temple, and in black garments; among the metals, the lead was devoted to him: 2nd, among the Egyptians, the day of Saturn was the first, not the seventh day of the week: 3rd, from the passage of Dio Cassius above referred to, it does not even appear that the old Egyptians designated the days after the planets (see *Ideler*, Chronol. i. 180); but there is certainly no trace of such appellation among the Hebrews, Syrians, and most of the Arabic tribes: 4th, Supposing, even, that the prophet Amos indignantly reproached the Israelites, that they had served the idol Saturn in the desert—which fact even cannot be proved, at least not from the word כיון, which simply means *statue*—it does by no means follow, that Moses sanctioned his worship by instituting the Sabbath as a day consecrated to *Saturn* (against *Bohlen*, Gen. Intr. p. 137, see *Tuch*, Gen. p. 14. *et seq.*; compare *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. ii. p. 343—348). Thus we are perfectly justified in considering the Sabbath as an originally Mosaic ordinance; and even if, as is not impossible, similar institutions are found among other ancient nations also, the profound spiritual and religious character with which the Sabbath is invested, is, undoubtedly, peculiar to the Hebrew legislator. "What Moses created out of the last day of the week, was something quite new, which had never before existed among any nation, or in any religion. The last day was to be devoted to rest: all the usual labours of man were to be interrupted, and a universal stillness should prevail. Then man should resign every gain and enjoyment after which he aspires in his ordinary toils and pursuits: this is the *sacrifice of self-denial* which he has to offer, a sacrifice widely different from all the offerings of other times and nations, but not so very easy for the human mind, which is gain-seeking, and absorbed in the turmoil of the world" (*Ewald*, Antiq. p. 107). The same critic calls the Sabbath "the greatest and most productive idea of Mosaism" (compare p. 104—112); and *Baehr* (Symb. ii. p. 592) remarks, that we find, in the whole ancient world, as little a parallel institution of the Sabbath as of Mosaism itself.

וְאֶת־הָאָ֖רֶץ אֶת־הַיָּם֙ וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־בָּ֔ם וַיָּ֖נַח בַּיּ֣וֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִ֑י עַל־כֵּ֗ן
בֵּרַ֧ךְ יְהוָ֛ה אֶת־י֥וֹם הַשַּׁבָּ֖ת וַֽיְקַדְּשֵֽׁהוּ׃ ס 12 כַּבֵּ֥ד

Heathen nations had, however, a knowledge of the Hebrew Sabbath, but the curious character of the accounts which they give of it is well calculated to cause our astonishment. Tacitus (Hist. v. 4) writes: "On the seventh day, it is reported, they resolved to celebrate rest, because that day brought them rest from their toils; later they devoted the seventh year also to laziness, since they had tasted the sweetness of indolence. Others allege, that this is an honour rendered to Saturn [see *supra*], either because they received the elements of their religion from the Idaeans [Cretans], who, we are informed, were expelled from that country with Saturn, and were the founders of the nation; or else, because, among the seven planets by which men are governed, the star of Saturn moves in the highest orbit, and exercises the greatest influence, and because most of the heavenly bodies complete their effects and their course by the number seven"!! (see *Introduction*, § 3. viii). Plutarch, on the other hand (Sympos. iv.) believes, that the Sabbath is celebrated in honour of Bacchus, because this deity is also called *Sabbas*, and was, on festive occasions, invoked with *Saboi*. Justinius (xxxvi. 2) observes: "On the march to the old Syrian father-land, Moses encamped at Mount Sinai. When he, at last, after a fast of seven days in the desert of Arabia, arrived there with his people, completely exhausted, he appointed the seventh day, called Sabbath, in the language of the people, for all eternity as a fast-day (!), because that day had concluded their hunger and their wanderings." In this account the origin and the nature of the Sabbath are stated with equal inaccuracy, for fasting, which would have been in opposition to the cheerful character of the day, was expressly forbidden (see *supra*; compare *Introduction*, § iii. 9). And yet is the same error found in Suetonius (Life of Augustus, lxxvi); Persius (v. 184), and Petronius (Fragm. p. 883, Ed. Burmanni). But the most ludicrous statement is that of Apion, which is too curious to be omitted here; he says (Josephus contra Apion, ii. 2): "When the Jews had travelled a six days' journey, they had buboes in their groins: on this account it was that they rested on the seventh day, having arrived safely in that country which is now called Judea; then they preserved the language of the Egyptians, and called that day the Sabbath, for that malady of buboes was named Sabatosis by the Egyptians." Impudence and ignorance vie here for the palm.

We will not leave this subject without citing, as a deeply-felt tribute of respect and veneration, a few remarks from the gifted pen of an individual, who has devoted all energies to the moral and social amelioration of our toiling, care-worn fellow-men, who was, alas! too early called away from the sphere of earthly activity; but who now, this is our consolation, enjoys, in better worlds, as a blessed spirit, the glorious rest of an everlasting Sabbath: "We are all conscious of the mind's affinity to the Supreme Being, we are sensible of its unfathomable thoughts, its lofty aspirations, and its bright-winged hopes; but yet the spiritual life which embodies these hopes and thoughts is not the one we habitually lead. Beside and around us is the world, with its labours and its cares, its pomps and its vanities; before us is virtue, is duty, is eternity; the Sabbath is a bridge thrown across life's troubled waters, over which we may pass to reach the opposite shore—a link between earth and heaven. . . . . For as the earthly Sabbath calls upon the worldly being to give place to the spiritual one, to lay aside for awhile the cares and labours of earth, to put on the repose and holiness of heaven, so is it but a type of the eternal day, when the freed spirit, if it be true to itself and to

sea, and all that *is* in them, and rested on the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.—12. Honour thy father and thy mother, that

God, shall put on for ever its robe of immortal holiness and joy."—(*Mrs. Horatio Montefiore*, A few Words to the Jews, pp. 102, 134; a work which breathes throughout the purest and loftiest idealism).

FIFTH COMMANDMENT. VENERATION OF PARENTS. VER. 12.

After the system of the duties towards God has been laid down in the three first commandments, and after its practical execution has been secured by an eternal and solemn institution, in the fourth, the commandment of filial love and obligation towards parents, follows with admirable wisdom, as a transition to the duties towards our fellow-men. For the illustration of this precept nothing seems more adapted than the following passage in Lev. xix, 2, 3: "Speak to *all* the congregation of the children of Israel, and say to them, *You shall be holy; for I the Lord your God am holy. You shall fear every man his mother, and his father, and keep my Sabbaths. I am the Lord your God.*" Here the sanctification of the Sabbath and the veneration of the parents are placed together—and both are considered as the first criteria and the first conditions of the internal resemblance of man to God. Namely, as we have demonstrated, that without the Sabbath all the other duties towards God would have remained but an empty, aerial, and speculative theory, and that by that institution only they were raised to a reality and a truth; thus the conscientious observance of the filial duties forms the foundation of all our obligations towards our fellow-men. For the family is the basis of society; and the parents are the centre of the family. The disorganization of family-life in a state is the surest and most melancholy symptom of its decay; the disobedient son will be a faithless husband, as he will undoubtedly prove an unpatriotic citizen, a untrustworthy friend, and an undutiful man. The very wording of our commandment proves that it has a political back-ground; it promises long life in the land, in which the Israelites were to form a nation; domestic virtues are a guarantee for social and civil excellence; both are branches of the same stem; both flourish and both decay together. And Ebn Ezra was so clearly conscious of this truth, that he explains these words thus: "If Israel keeps this commandment it will not be exiled from the promised land." If, therefore, the promise of long life for filial piety does not always appear to be personally verified, it is certainly always realized in a social sense; the trespasses of the individual redound on the state as a whole; they accelerate its political decline; and as the Mosaic law always addresses the whole people as a unity; as the duties of the individual are invariably conceived in their bearings on the entire community: so we find here both relations internally interwoven; the personal and civil duties concentrate in the same point; the one are the emanations of the others. And thus it is improper pedantically to urge the literal meaning of that promise. But even with respect hereto we must keep in mind, that not every thing is discord which appears so to the superficial observer; that many a premature death may be merited, although we see no obvious guilt; that there exists an internal and necessary connection between our deeds and our fates; that the heart of man can never divest itself from this conviction without destroying its very life-blood; and if all this does not suffice to restore, in our eyes, the harmony between conduct and destiny, we are referred to another existence, in which full compensation will be made, and in which the adjustment will be perfect. "If God takes an obedient son," remarks

אֶת־אָבִיךָ וְאֶת־אִמֶּךָ לְמַעַן יַאֲרִכוּן יָמֶיךָ עַל הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר־יְהוָה

Calvin, "early from this life, He remains, nevertheless, as truly faithful to His promise, as if a person who has promised to his neighbour one acre, gives him a hundred. It is of the highest importance to understand, that long life is promised to us as a *symbol or pledge of the divine grace*, but that God may bestow it upon us often in an infinitely higher degree in a future world." Thus our promise is also far from establishing that principle of external or earthly felicity (εὐδαιμονία), which has often been found in it, to the derogation of this commandment (for instance, by *Kant*, Vernunftreligion, pp. 93, 150, 151).

If filial love were nothing but a duty of gratitude towards the parents as the greatest benefactors of our infancy and youth, it would necessarily be boundless and eternal, and its violation would deserve the severest punishment; for ingratitude to earthly benefactors is always accompanied with indifference to the divine blessings; and the Jewish sages justly remark: "How should he, who forgets the benefits of his human, visible friends, gratefully remember the gifts of God, whom he does not see with his external senses." And from this point of view, ingratitude was, even among the Persians, punished with death, because it inevitably degenerates into impiety. Thus it cannot surprise us, that in the Mosaic legislation, filial refractoriness, disrespect by deed or language, and even disobedience, of such children, who in spite of the paternal admonitions, would not desist from certain notorious vices, were capitally punished: they are not only superfluous, but dangerous members of society; neither the authority of God, nor the rights of men are sacred from their audacity and degeneracy. (See Lev. xx. 9; Exod. xxi. 15; Deut. xxi. 18—21; *Joseph.* Antiq. IV. viii. 24; Apion ii. 27).

But it is not merely gratitude, which the children owe to their parents; the relation between parents and children is no conventional one; the children have no right to consider it dissolved or relaxed, if they believe that they have not experienced from their parents a sufficient amount of affection and of benefits; even the parents themselves have no power to modify it by dispensing with the respect due to them by their children. The latter are not the equals of the parents; they are subordinated to them by birth, divine right and reason; *the parents are the visible representatives of God*; the *dii terrestres*; they are the middle link between the children and God as Creator; they are not only their nourishers, but also their first and most efficient instructors; not physically only, but morally also, they give them existence and vigour: the relation between parents and children is, therefore, holy, religious, godly, not of a purely human character; it is a profanation, to weigh and measure filial affection and devotion after the degree of enjoyed benefits; it must be unlimited and eternal like our love to the Creator. And therefore our text does not speak of mere gratitude towards the parents, but of *honoring*, or in other passages, of *fearing* them (Lev. xix. 3); the former expression alludes to the internal, to the mind's connection between parents and children; the latter to the unconditional subordination of the one under the will of the other; for the same words (honor and fear) are applied with reference to God also (see Ps. cxv. 1). The Rabbinical sages say expressly: "The awe of the parents must be upon thee like the awe of God"; they place, in fact, the duties towards the parents in many respects on the same principles as those towards God. Therefore this commandment contains, like the four preceding ones, the words: "the Lord thy God" (יי׳ אלהיך), and which are obviously intended to remind us, that here divine duties are enjoined; whereas those words do not occur in the five last commandments. God Himself cannot be called by a name more endearing, more affecting and sacred than that of Father (compare

thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy

p. 332); and both father and mother are used, beyond their literal meaning, for all individuals who guard others with loving care and faithful solicitude (compare Gen. xlv. 8; Judges v. 7). Thus both the embodiment of this precept in the decalogue is justified, and the place which it occupies in this momentous code, in the exact middle between the godly and the human duties, is logically appropriate.

In order to secure a more conscientious observance of this duty, the reward is added: a long life in the promised land.—We are no admirers of artificial or mystical explanations; but it may be safely admitted, that filial disobedience does not only indicate, in the organization of the individual, a moral and mental anomaly, but also a physical disorder, which renders a long and happy life almost impossible. And further, "experience teaches us frequently," observes Philippson, "that in this sphere especially a visible Nemesis persecutes the fate of man, so that the children generally recompense to their parents that which these have done to their own parents." The reward corresponds exactly with the command; God promises for the dutiful veneration of the parents a prolongation of that life which the latter have given to the children; and these are constantly reminded of their Father in heaven, on whom they are dependent besides their earthly parents.

It is well known, that the heathen nations also considered this duty as a holy debt, which it was incumbent upon every man most scrupulously to pay. With regard to the Greeks and Romans, this requires scarcely any further exposition; see *Plat.* Legg. ii. 931, *et seq.*; compare sentences like these: "parentem vereri ut Deum debemus—neque enim multo secus parens liberis (*Cicero*); Οὐδ' αὖ πάλιν μείζων ἐπίδειξις ἀθέου γέγονε τῆς περὶ γονεῖς ὀλιγωρίας καὶ πλημμελείας (*Plutarch*, compare *supra*). Πάντες λέγουσι καὶ ᾄδουσιν, ὡς γονεῦσι τιμὴν μετὰ θεοὺς πρώτην καὶ μεγίστην ἥ τε φύσις, ὅ τε τὴν φύσιν σώζων νόμος ἀπέδωκε (*Idem*).

About the Chinese, says Du Halde: "Nothing can be compared to the reverence which is shown by the children to their parents; they speak little, and never sit down in their presence. They have the custom, on certain days, as, for instance, on the first day of the year, the birth-day, and on some other occasions, to honour them by kneeling down before them, and touching the ground several times with their foreheads. Even after the death of their parents they preserve their filial devotion, and they render to them the same homage as if they were still living."—"In Persia a son never sits in the presence of his father, or his mother; even the king's son always stands before him, and is regarded only as the first of his servants." *Morier's* Travels, p. 134. The same notions prevailed among the ancient Egyptians. It was considered unbecoming for a child to sit down in the presence of his father, without his permission; still more so to smoke before him. The mummies of the parents were considered as their most valuable and most sacred property, and were regarded as the safest pledges for debts; their memory was cherished and revered for successive generations, and their tombs were maintained with the most scrupulous care. Parricide, perhaps the most unnatural of all crimes, was punished with unusual severity. The criminal was lacerated with sharpened reeds, thrown on thorns, and burnt to death; but if a father murdered his child, the corpse of the deceased was fastened round the neck of the former, in which position he was obliged to remain for three whole days and nights, under the control of a public guard.

The later books of the Old Testament are replete with injunctions regarding this commandment; the Proverbs repeat, incessantly, such exhortations; and the beautiful tale concerning the Rechabites, in Jeremiah xxxv, is universally known.

אֱלֹהֶיךָ נֹתֵן לָךְ׃ ס 13 לֹא
תִּרְצַח׃ ס לֹא

the curse of the mother destroys them to the ground......Child, take care of thy father in his old age, and do not grieve him as long as he lives. If he decreases in understanding, be indulgent, and do not despise him on account of thy full vigour......Like a blasphemer is he who forsakes his father, and cursed by the Lord is he who gives pain to his mother." The attentive reader will easily discover, that these words of Sirach merely develop the internal idea of the fifth commandment, and that they unfold that which is here enclosed as in an embryo (compare Gen. xxvii. 4, 12; Prov. xxiii. 22; Joreh Deah § 240). — The decalogue in Deuteronomy, has, after אמך, the words כאשר צוך יי׳ אלהיך, and, after ימיך, the addition ולמען ייטב לך, which latter words the Samaritan and Septuagint versions have in our passage also, see p. 343. יאריכון (Future Hiphil of ארך, with ן epentheticum) is, by Ebn Ezra, taken in a transitive sense: "that they (the parents) may prolong thy life." But the intransitive signification, *to be long*, is here more natural, as in 1 Kings viii. 8, and especially in Deut. xxv. 15. —About the punishment fixed for the violation of filial duties, see note on xxi. 15, 17.

but they are equally severe in threatening punishments to those who violate their filial duties; so, for instance, Prov. xxx. 17: "The eye that mocketh at the father, and disdains to obey the mother, the ravens of the valley shall pick it out, and the young eagles shall eat it." The Talmud, especially, abounds in admonitions, touching narratives, and examples of this kind; it calls our precept the most important of all human duties, places it at the head of those laws for the observance of which we enjoy a double reward, on earth and in heaven, and makes the value of the nine other commandments depend on the manner in which this precept is fulfilled; but it includes the teachers also, as the spiritual parents, in the same veneration (compare Kiddushin, 30, 31; Jerus. Peah, cap. 1; Ketuboth, i. 7; Debar. Rabb. cap. 1, to end; Mishna, Bab. Mez. 1, to end). Beautiful precepts are also contained in the book Sirach, especially in the third chapter, where we read: "The Lord has raised the father over the children, and has appointed the judgment of the mother over the sons......He who honours his father, will rejoice at his children, and be heard on the day when he prays......The blessing of the fathers supports the houses of the children; but

SECOND TABLE.

Sixth Commandment.—Against Murder. Ver. 13.

The external form of the laws of the second table, differs, in several remarkable points from the form of the first table. As the five first commandments treat of our duties towards God, we find, in each of them, that relation hinted at by the words "the Lord thy God" (see *supra*, p. 364), whereas, in the five last commandments, which refer to our duties towards our fellow-men, the words "thy neighbour," are four times repeated. Further, the first table contains, at each precept, some explanatory addition; the second pronounces, briefly and emphatically, the mere laws, without a word of elucidation. The reason is obvious. Our relation to God is obscure and hidden, and requires, therefore, some illustration; but our position towards our fellow-men is familiar to us, for, since we can, as men, feel the wrongs which others do to us, we have an unerring guide how we ought to act towards others (see *Baumgarten*, Comm. I. ii. 15). About the connection of this commandment with the whole decalogue, see p. 340. —The Septuagint, the English Version, and others, divide the following three com-

God giveth thee.—13. Thou shalt not [1]murder.—Thou

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Kill.

mandments into three different verses (13, 14, 15), and, in some manuscripts, the commandment against adultery precedes that against murder, and, in this order, these precepts are enumerated by Philo. But both the version in Deuteronomy, and the Samaritan codex, agree with the arrangement in Exodus, which, as we have shown, is admirable for its logical clearness.—Attempts have been made by the Talmudists, to bring the laws of the first tablet into correspondence and harmony with those of the second, so that every divine precept is parallel with a kindred human duty. Although we do not find the results of these endeavours always unforced and simple, yet, with respect to murder, the Pentateuch itself seems to invite to such comparison; for, in Gen. ix. 6, the prohibition of that crime is introduced, with the addition: "for in the image of God made He man," so that a murder committed against a human being seems like an assault upon the divine majesty itself, that is, a negation of the first commandment; and the unspeakable horror which the legislator everywhere expresses for murder, and which he evidently strives to implant in the hearts of the Israelites also, seems, indeed, to originate in a similar consideration. If blood covered the soil, the land is considered defiled and polluted; it cried to heaven, and its voice is not silenced before the crime is expiated by the death of the perpetrator. If blood remains unrevenged, it is threatened, that the land which witnesses such abomination would "vomit out" its inhabitants. From such severe principles resulted naturally, a high and sublime notion of the dignity of man, of the sacredness of human life—and this is, again, the source of all social virtues, the germ of all righteousness; for he who is accustomed to see in every fellow-man, however humble, a sacred being, a representative of God, will faithfully and cheerfully perform all duties which he owes to him; all acts of daily intercourse will assume the character of a religious purity, they will be priestly functions. Thus the first commandment of the second table points to the very centre and kernel of the whole table: and, as the love of our neighbour comes from God, so it leads back to Him; for that continued and uninterrupted service ennobles the mind, leads to humility and submission, prevents a proud presumption and tyrannical treatment of the fellow-man, connects all actions with a higher idea, and kindles, incessantly, the flame of belief; and so the unity of both tables is established.

The question about *suicide* is as little treated, in the Mosaic law, as those of parricide and child-murder; but the Jewish exegesis finds it interdicted in Gen. ix. 5, in the words: ואך את־דמכם לנפשתיכם אדרש, "but your blood (that is, your *own* blood, which you shed yourselves) I will demand from your souls (that is, in after-life)." Perhaps Moses considered it superfluous to enact a law against a crime which he believed to be so unnatural that it would not easily be committed. In fact, it was but rarely perpetrated among the Israelites; for, in the whole Old Testament, only three cases of this kind are mentioned, Saul, Ahithophel, and Zimri; whilst in the later unfortunate period of the Roman war they increased to a most fearful extent. The reason assigned by Michaelis, that Moses would, by a direct prohibition, have made the unconscious crime a conscious and, therefore, more punishable sin, without thereby in any way preventing it, is untenable; as, by that argument, almost the whole criminal legislation could be represented as injurious. However, suicide is indubitably against the spirit of Mosaism, and this has been beautifully developed by Josephus (Bell. Jud. III. viii. 5). After having adduced the general philosophical and rational arguments against that crime, especially that we see in Nature, which we must

תִּנְאָף׃ ס לֹא

תִּגְנֹב׃ ס לֹא־תַעֲנֶה

take as our guide, no animal destroy itself spontaneously, and that—which remark is particularly directed against the stoics—it requires much more fortitude to bear the miseries of misfortune than cowardly to escape them by a momentary pain, he treats this question from a theological point of view in the following manner: "And do you not think, that God is very indignant when a man wantonly wastes that which He has bestowed on him? for from Him it is that we have received our being, and we ought to leave it to His disposal to take that being away from us. The bodies of all men are, indeed, mortal, and are created out of corruptible matter; but the soul is ever immortal, and is a portion of the Deity, which inhabits our bodies; besides, if any one destroys or abuses a deposit which he has received from a mere man, he is esteemed a wicked and perfidious person; but if any one expels from his body this divine deposit, can we imagine that He, who is thereby affronted, does not know it? Moreover, our law justly ordains, that slaves, who run away from their masters, shall be punished, though the masters from whom they escaped may have been cruel to them. And shall we endeavour to run away from God, who is the best of all masters, and not think ourselves highly guilty of impiety? Do you not know, that those who depart out of this life according to the law of nature, and pay that debt, which was received from God, when He that lent it us is pleased to require it back, enjoy eternal fame? that their houses and their posterity are sure, that their souls are pure and obedient, and obtain a most holy place in heaven, whence, in the revolution of ages, they are again sent into pure bodies; whilst the souls of those who have acted madly against themselves are received in the darkest place in Hades, and while God, who is their father, punishes those offenders in their posterity? [Comp., however, p. 348 *et seq.*]. From this reason, God hates such acts, and the crime is punished by our most wise legislator. Accordingly, our laws determine, that the bodies of such as kill themselves should be exposed without burial till sun-set [see, however, *infra*], although it is lawful to bury our enemies *sooner*. The laws of other nations also enjoin, that such men's hands, with which they waged war against themselves, be cut off when they are dead, believing that, as the body is alien from the soul, so is the hand alien from the body. It behoves us, therefore, to reason justly, and not to add to the human calamities impiety towards our Creator." The instances of suicide mentioned in the Old Testament (1 Sam. xxxi. 4; 2 Sam. xvii. 23; 1 Kings xvi. 18) prove, of course, nothing for their lawfulness. But it appears, from the history of Ahithophel (2 Sam. xvii. 23, *et seq.*), that self-murderers did not forfeit the right of disposal of their property, and that they even were not excluded from the usual privileges of burial. Compare the philosophical arguments against suicide of Leibnitz, Montesquieu, J. J. Rousseau, and others, in Genoude's Commentary, p. 294.

The notion of murder has been considerably enlarged by Jewish tradition; the Talmud contains, among others, the following dicta: "Who robs his neighbour of the least trifle is like a person who takes away his life."—"He who makes the face of his fellow-man become pale for shame is like an individual who sheds blood."—"He who makes his fellow-creature sin commits a greater crime than the murderer." Ebn Ezra also enumerates several similar cases which morally amount to murder. However, although all these ideas are, *implicite*, included in our commandment, the preceding remarks will have sufficed to show, that we can here think of the actual murder only, that is, the *intentional* killing of a man; for the justifiable and

shalt not commit adultery.—Thou shalt not steal.—Thou

excusable homicide, (מכה נפש בשגגה Numb. xxxv. 15; or רוצח את־רעהו בבלי דעת, Deut. iv. 42), were not capitally punished. We have treated the laws about murder fully in our notes on xxi. 12—14, to which we refer.

Seventh Commandment. Against Adultery. Sacredness of Matrimony. Ver. 13.

After the commandment concerning the persons of the neighbours, follows organically the precept concerning individuals who are, in certain respects, identical with the persons of the fellowmen themselves, and yet, in other regards, form a property; thus the commandment against murder is logically succeeded by that against adultery. Or we may view the connection thus: the sixth commandment protects the life; the seventh secures the rights of her who prolongs and continues it through the progeny, and who is "the mother of life" (Gen. iii. 20). The notion of matrimony has, in the Old Testament, from the very commencement, been conceived in admirable purity and perfection. Already the wife of Adam is called "a help at his side," that is, a companion through life, with whom he coalesces to one being (Gen. ii. 18, 24). Matrimony is frequently denominated "a covenant of God" (Prov. ii. 17, etc.; compare Zend Avesta, Jescht Zade xxxi). The prophet Malachi calls the wife a helpmate and friend; and conjugal faithlessness, treachery, which brings down the anger and constant displeasure of God; even divorce is described as hateful in His eyes (ii. 14—16); and in the Proverbs a virtuous wife is called the "crown of her husband" (xii. 4); and a wise helpmate, "the gift of God," whilst houses and wealth are but the inheritance from the fathers (xix. 14; compare v. 15—19; Ps. cxxviii. 3).

As, therefore, the relation between the conjugal couple was considered as an absolutely internal and sacred one, it follows, that its violation by either party was regarded a punishable crime, and thus the severity is explicable, with which the Mosaic law denounces such transgressions; for the adulterer was punished with death (Lev. xx. 10; Deut. xxii. 22); unchastity of a betrothed was threatened with the death of both offending parties (Deut. xxii. 23). The same severity is observable in the other books of the Old Testament. Job exclaims (xxxi. 11, 12): "It [adultery] is a heinous crime; yea, it is an iniquity to be punished by the judges. For it is a fire that consumeth to destruction, and uproots all my increase." The Rabbins also denounce with almost implacable severity the nefariousness of adultery: "God looks upon every sin with long-sufferance, except on unchastity;" and they are inexhaustible in precepts and advice, how effectually to ward off the bad propensities, and especially the sinful imaginations.

This rigour will be the less surprising, if we consider, that the existence of the families, and consequently the safety of the whole social structure is most immediately endangered by the violation of this commandment; and it is this *social* importance especially, which is embodied in our law, since the purely *moral* prohibition is contained in the tenth commandment: "Thou shalt not covet the wife of thy neighbour." Thus, in our precept the fatal effects upon society, in the last commandment, the corruption of the heart as the source of the impiousness of adultery is pre-eminently regarded. Erroneous is, therefore, Ebn Ezra's opinion, who believes, that our precept includes every unchaste conduct and desire, and who quotes from Saadiah a sixfold gradation of that sin; Rashi already observes correctly, that it treats only of real adultery with the wedded wife of another; as this crime is morally and politically the most baneful. The decalogue contains merely the general prohibitions,

בְרֵעֲךָ עֵד שָׁקֶר׃ ס 14 לֹא

which the later legislation develops and enlarges in the same spirit. (Compare about unchastity, note on xxii. 15, 16).

It requires scarcely any proof to show the honorable position which the women occupied in Hebrew society. From the very creation of the woman, who is a part of man himself, and for whose sake he "shall leave his father and his mother, so that both be one flesh," down to the glorious picture of the virtuous wife in the last chapter of the Proverbs, the whole Bible breathes the highest regard for female excellence, and assigns to the weaker sex that sound and noble rank which forms the just medium between its Oriental degradation and the exaggerated gallantry of the romantic epochs. We need only to mention the wives of the patriarchs, the names of Miriam, Deborah, the wife of Manoah, Hannah, Michal, Abigail, the queen Maachah (1 Kings xv. 13), the Shunamite, and the prophetess Huldah, the pious women who regularly served in the holy tabernacle, the daughters of Shiloh dancing in the vineyards, the women who proclaim the triumph and glory of David over Goliath, and the most tender descriptions of the Song of Songs; and it will readily occur to all minds, what degree of liberty, of respect, of education, and of influence the Hebrew women enjoyed. The history of the creation ("she shall be called woman—אשה—because she was taken out of man—איש"), appears even to imply the highest and most ideal form of matrimonial life, monogamy, which seems only not to have been expressly enforced from the same regard for deep-rooted national feelings, which Moses wisely respected in many other instances. Several Mosaic laws seem, indeed, to be based on monogamy (Deut. xxv. 5); and as marriage was considered as a religious duty to every one, polygamy was *eo ipso* excluded; for the opinion, that in the East more females are born than males, is not borne out by fact (*Burdach*, Physiologie I. 403). Other laws are evidently calculated to render polygamy very inconvenient, if not often impossible (compare especially Deut. xxiii. 1; Lev. xv. 18; xxi. 10). Monogamy seems, therefore, even in the times before the exile, to have been the rule, except with rich and noble individuals; it is the basis of many poetical descriptions (Prov. xxxi.; Ps. cxxviii.); later, it became almost general (Tob. i. 11; Sir. xxvi. 1, etc.), till it was at last commanded by a law of Rabbi Gershon ben Judah, in the year 1020, at the synod of Worms. The case seems, in fact, to have been very analogous to that of the Egyptians. For, on the one hand, observes Herodotus (ii. 92), that every Egyptian married but one wife; whilst on the other hand, Diod. (i. 80) remarks, that the priests took but one wife, the others as many as they liked. Monogamy seems, then, to have been the rule, polygamy the exception. The history of the patriarchs is, in this respect, very instructive. Abraham resigns every hope of posterity, rather than taking another wife besides Sarah (Gen. xv. 2), who urges him to take Hagar. And Jacob intended, originally, to marry Rachel only; the fraud of Laban induced him to take her sister besides; the maid-servants were then brought to him by his wives. The word "concubine" (פלגש) is nowhere mentioned in the Mosaic code; in fact, it does not occur in the four last books of the Pentateuch; and Moses seems to have disapproved of such intercourse with women who occupied an intermediate position between wife and servant (see note on xxi. 7—11). Even the New Testament does not, by a general law, abolish polygamy; it orders only that the bishop should be one wife's husband (1 Tim. iii. 2); just as monogamy seems to have been prescribed to the Hebrew priests (Lev. xxi. 14). The very name of the woman in Hebrew, compared with her designations in Greek and Latin, proves the high position of the female sex among the Israelites: אשה is, according to Gen. ii. 23, a part and a part-

shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.—

ner of man (אִישׁ), perfectly equal to him in dignity; she bore his name (Isa. iv. 1); whilst γυνή (from γείνω) and femina (from feo, whence fetus, fecundus) indicate merely a sexual relation to the man. The bitter invectives of Solomon against women originated in his unnatural and anti-Mosaic excess, which precluded him from studying and admiring the excellencies of the sex in *one* attached and loving wife.—The same cultivated principles with regard to the estimation of the woman, have been expressed and enjoined by the Talmud. We quote some Rabbinical adages: "A man who loses his first wife feels grief as if the temple had been destroyed in his days" (*Jalk.* Ezek. 30 *b*). "The generations are only saved on account of the piety of the virtuous women" (*Jalk.* Ruth § 606). "He who lives without a wife lives without joy" (*Jalk.* Jerem. lxvi. *b*). "The very altar sheds tears for him who divorces his first wife" (*Jalk.* Malachi 87 *b*). "An honourable man honours his wife; a despicable man despises her" (*Judah Ebn Tibbon*, Iggereth Ha-musar). We find in the Rabbinical writings no sentences like that of the Arabians: "The shame of the woman is everlasting;" or of the scholastic ages: "Mulier Satanæ opus;" or of the French: "Celui que Dieu veut aider, sa femme lui est enlevée;" or, "A qui perd sa femme et un denier, c'est grand dommage pour le denier." The Israelites never knew the demoralizing custom of the Greeks to lend away their wives (*Potter*, Arch. ii. 544); they neither required from them that divine worship, by prostration and prayer, which the Persians demanded (*Zend Avesta*, ed. Kleuker, iii. 231); nor did they ever adopt the barbarous madness of the Indians, who burn the surviving widows. Even the latest Jewish writings have invariably and faithfully preserved that purity in the notions concerning women, which pervades the pages of the inspired authors. But the Hebrew women deserved that respect, and maintained their dignity by the severity of their morals, and by their exemplary activity; even princesses assisted in all domestic duties (compare 2 Sam. xiii. 8; 1 Sam. ii. 19; Prov. xxxi. 10, *et seq.*). In the more flourishing epochs of the history of Israel, the women kept virtuously at home (compare נות בית in Psa. lxviii. 13); the contrary custom was a symptom of the decay of public morals (2 Macc. iii. 19). Respect and veneration for the *mother* and the father are always enforced with equal emphasis (verse 12; xxi. 15, 17; Lev. xix. 3, etc; where she is even mentioned before the father, etc; compare *Mishn.* Kerith. vi. 9). The rights of both sexes are, almost in every respect, equal; for Mosaism degrades no person to a *thing*, as was the case with the Roman slaves; nor does it deliver up any individual to the arbitrariness of a superior, as was the fate of the Roman wives and children, who stood entirely under the power of their husbands and parents; as we shall prove in its due place. The punishments for the crimes of unchastity were also nearly identical, in both sexes, which is another weighty argument for the dignity attributed to the other sex. And yet was their personal liberty by far not so restricted as among other Oriental nations (except the Egyptians, where the position of the woman was rather anomalous; Diod. i. 27); they took, *unveiled*, part in the domestic occupations (Gen. xii. 14); they were visible to strangers (Gen. xx. 2); they lived, in Palestine, together with the men, not separated in immoral and voluptuous harems (Exod. xxi. 22; 1 Sam. ix. 11, etc.); they appeared even in all public processions and festivities, actively and honourably co-operating with dances and music (Exod. xv. 20; 1 Sam. xviii. 6, 7; Psa. lxviii. 26); their praise was the sweetest reward, the strongest encouragement of the hero; and often they were themselves the envied prize of distinguished valour (Josh. xv. 15, *et seq.*; 1 Sam. xviii. 20).

תַחְמֹד בֵּית רֵעֶךָ ס לֹא־
תַחְמֹד אֵשֶׁת רֵעֶךָ וְעַבְדּוֹ וַאֲמָתוֹ וְשׁוֹרוֹ וַחֲמֹרוֹ וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר
לְרֵעֶךָ׃ פ שביעי

EIGHTH COMMANDMENT. AGAINST THEFT. VERSE 13.

A state in which the property of the citizens is unsafe and, by impunity of the offenders, exposed to incessant attacks, cannot prosper or flourish; the sound development of its national resources is checked and crippled; the social order, in general, is deranged; and the very existence of the commonwealth becomes precarious and liable to chaotic anarchy. As violation of the right of property is, therefore, a social crime, it was, necessarily, interdicted in the decalogue, which contains the fundamental laws of the political structure. But an encroachment upon foreign property is, at the same time, a crime against a fellow-man personally; for every property is, or represents, the fruit and produce of human industry, integrity, or intelligence, strengthened and guided by the divine blessing; it is, therefore, sacred; and its violation is an act of arbitrary tyranny—of unscrupulous aggression against the right of the neighbour; and, therefore, the commandment against theft stands on the second table; and succeeds, logically, the prohibitions against the destruction of life, and the defilement of matrimony. But it follows hence, with equal certainty, that our commandment treats of the real and actual theft, of the undeniable attack against the property of others. Although, therefore, the observation of Rabbinical interpreters, that he who deceives his neighbour in measure or weight, or in business in general, is included in this command; as also he who, like Absalom, steals the hearts or good affections of others, is perfectly in harmony with the spirit of our interdiction: yet all these shades and subdivisions are not directly implied in it. See our further remarks, especially about the efficient and just punishment of theft in the notes on xxi. 37 to xxii. 3.

NINTH COMMANDMENT. AGAINST FALSE WITNESS. VERSE 13.

If the three preceding commandments are directed against wrongs inflicted upon our neighbour by the *deed*, the ninth forbids encroachments upon his interests by the *word*, either in private life by falsehood, calumny, insult, defamation and envious detraction, or before public tribunals by false witness. Even common slander and false reports are repeatedly forbidden: "You shall not deal falsely nor lie one to another" (Lev. xix. 11); "thou shalt not raise a false report" (Exod. xxiii. 1); and the infamy, which falls upon the head of the calumniator, is perfectly just, since calumny renders the private intercourse between man and man almost impossible, creates enmities, sows discord, provokes hatred among friends, and may, in fact, embitter life in all its various relations. But every lie is, irrespective of its baneful consequences, a base crime, an offence against the nobleness of our soul, because it is treason against truth. But still more fearful in its destructive effects is the false witness; it undermines, almost literally, the pillars of social order, by falsifying the ways of justice; it may remove the useful and virtuous citizen from the community, and protect and raise the criminal, to the great detriment of the state; it may often necessarily include or occasion a false oath; the calumniator may also become a perjurer; the third and the ninth commandments may be violated at the same time; and thus the false witness is as degraded in a moral point of view as he is perilous in a political respect; thus we can understand why this command was embodied in the decalogue; and thus we

14. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house; thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that *is* thy neighbour's.

may appreciate the horror with which Jonathan, in his paraphrase, exclaims, at the end of this commandment: "by a false witness the clouds withhold their rain, the dew falls no more, and a famine spreads over the world;" and the Proverbs are replete with protestations and admonitions against that crime: "A man that beareth false witness against his neighbour is a hammer, and a sword, and a sharp arrow." The Mosaic code also contains a deterring and energetic law against that depravity: "If a false witness rise up against any man to testify against him that which is wrong..., then shall you do to him as he had thought to have done to his brother: so shalt thou put the evil away from among you" (Deut. xix. 16—20). Thus are crime and punishment weighed in this law with a just balance. In order to prevent, as much as possible, the pernicious consequences of that crime, it was ordained, that in no law-suit one witness should suffice; two or three were required to confirm an assertion, which was then conscientiously and scrupulously examined by the judge (ibid. vers. 15, 18).—As this commandment is obviously of the highest practical and moral importance, the Jewish tradition has most carefully worked it out in all directions, especially with regard to witnesses, their depositions, and their punishment. Compare note on xxiii. 1.

TENTH COMMANDMENT.—AGAINST COVETOUS DESIRES.—VER. 14.

However excellent and indispensable the four preceding commandments are, they would alone be more properly adapted to a police and criminal code, which contains such laws only which are amenable to judicial punishment, and treats only of such offences as assume a visible shape. But the decalogue passes beyond this merely external point of view; its aim is not only to educate citizens of an earthly state, but members of the empire of heaven; not only to form loyal and useful, but virtuous and good men; it was, therefore, necessary to bring before its tribunal not only *deeds*, but also *intentions*. And this is the purport of the tenth commandment. Hereby only the decalogue receives its completion and perfection; by thus stopping the *source* of vice and training honest men, it removes vice itself, and, whilst only intent upon correcting the morals of the citizens, secures the external existence of the state. For, from the *will* spring the actions, and the wicked deed is preceded by the wicked thought; nobody acts wickedly who has not before felt wickedly. And, on the other hand, not every body is virtuous *before God* who is so *before men*; not every body is innocent who cannot be accused by an earthly judge; not every heart is pure that does not proceed to an impure deed; the mind may be filled with sinful imaginations, even if the hand is free from crime. But before God, who penetrates into the heart and searches the reins, purity of the soul is the principal requirement; and by enjoining that internal purity with particular emphasis, the decalogue is raised from the number of human legislations to the rank of a divine code, at the same time furnishing the clear indisputable proof, that Mosaism also is a deeply internal religion and theology, which is not contented with *good works* alone, but as strongly urges upon us purity and nobleness of thought; which idea is, in fact, most frequently repeated in the Old Testament (for instance, Psa. xv. 2; li. 12; etc., etc.). It has been asked, how the heart can be forbidden to covet anything, as the desire for some object involuntarily rises in the bosom, beyond the control or power

15 וְכָל־הָעָם רֹאִים אֶת־הַקּוֹלֹת וְאֶת־הַלַּפִּידִם וְאֵת קוֹל הַשֹּׁפָר
וְאֶת־הָהָר עָשֵׁן וַיַּרְא הָעָם וַיָּנֻעוּ וַיַּעַמְדוּ מֵרָחֹק׃ 16 וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֶל־
מֹשֶׁה דַּבֵּר־אַתָּה עִמָּנוּ וְנִשְׁמָעָה וְאַל־יְדַבֵּר עִמָּנוּ אֱלֹהִים פֶּן־
נָמוּת׃ 17 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־הָעָם אַל־תִּירָאוּ כִּי לְבַעֲבוּר נַסּוֹת
אֶתְכֶם בָּא הָאֱלֹהִים וּבַעֲבוּר תִּהְיֶה יִרְאָתוֹ עַל־פְּנֵיכֶם לְבִלְתִּי

of man. But not the mere *thought* which desires something is interdicted by לא תחמד, but only that stage of the wish in which it is enhanced to a desire for the *possession* of the object, which man may prevent by self-control and careful attention to the impulses of his heart. In Deuteronomy, לא תאוה is used instead of לא תחמד; between which two expressions the Rabbins establish the difference, that the תאוה leads to חימוד, and the חימוד again produces the deed, מעשה; so that the wicked deed deserves a threefold punishment; for even the תאוה arises only in a heart disposed to sin.—And thus the prohibition of unlawful desires concludes the decalogue, because it is the origin and sum of all the others; because it leads to the highest of all virtues, self-denial; and because it destroys, as it were, the root of sin; "it comprises the utmost spirituality of the Law;" and, as Ebn Ezra remarks, "the precepts of the heart are the most essential and most important of all" (מצות הלב הם העקרים הנכברים על כלם). The internal and spiritual character of the decalogue has been most ably explained and vindicated by Hengstenberg, Authent. of the Pent. ii. p. 597—607.—The principal objects which men usually covet are here individually enumerated, in order to point out with greater emphasis the unlawfulness of covetous desires, whether they be directed upon great and important possessions, or upon less dear and valuable objects.—That, according to some interpreters, this verse is divided into two commandments, we have observed in page 341; but we have tried to prove, that this separation of the parts, which necessarily belong together, is perfectly objectionable. The Samaritan codex has here considerable alterations, consisting especially in additions taken from the parallel narrative in Deuteronomy.

15, 16. After having finished the decalogue, the inspired writer continues the historical account. First, he describes the overwhelming impression which the divine appearance, "under thunder and flames, and the sound of trumpets, and the smoking mountain" produced upon the astounded people. Now only had they become perfectly conscious of the omnipotence of God; now only they felt their own littleness and sinfulness compared with God's grandeur and holiness; they tremble, recede, ask never to behold God's awfulness any more, and desire that Moses should henceforth be their mediator between themselves and God. Thus the divine revelation had worked that additional effect, that the authority of Moses was now unshaken, and that the people, at last, firmly believed in him (see xix. 9, and in the word ונשמעה, with the ה paragogicum, lies the readiness and willingness: "we will eagerly and gladly hear"). The expression ראים את־הקולת ואת הלפידים, "*they saw* the thunder and the lightnings," is, according to Gesenius (Lehrg. p. 853), the most easily to be explained as a zeugma, as it is not unfrequent in Hebrew, that is, that connection of one verb with two substantives, in which the former is strictly adapted to one substantive only, and another kindred verb is to be supplied for the logical connection with the second substantive; for instance, Job iv. 10, literally: "the voice of the fierce lion, and the teeth of the young lions,

15. And all the people witnessed the thunderings, and the lightnings, and the sound of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking: and when the people saw *it*, they shrunk back and stood afar off. 16. And they said to Moses, Speak thou with us, and we will readily hear; but let not God speak with us, lest we die. 17. And Moses said to the people, Fear not; for God is come to prove you, and that His fear may be before your faces, that you

are dashed to pieces" (נִתָּעוּ), to which phrase must be supplied: "the voice of the fierce lion is *silenced*, and the teeth," etc. Thus here also: "the people saw the flames, and the smoking mountain, and *heard* the thunder and the sound of the trumpet." Ebn Ezra believes, that one sense might be used instead of another, because they all concentrate into one point (the common sensorium); and Mendelssohn is of opinion, that the sight has been mentioned here, because the perceptions of the eye are more distinct and powerful than those of the other senses, and, therefore, more calculated to remove every doubt and uncertainty from the heart, and he translates, therefore, רֹאִים, by the general term *empfinden*, to perceive; compare, however, note on v. 21. לפיד flame; Septuagint, λαμπάδας.

17. As the people, according to the common belief of antiquity (see on iii. 6), deemed the appearance of God fatal to the life of man, Moses calms and assures them by pointing out two motives by which God was actuated in His personal proclamation of the decalogue: 1st, *To try the Israelites* (לבעבור נסות אתכם), that is, in order to give, by this solemn promulgation, additional strength to their belief, to banish every doubt from their minds, and thus to cause a more conscientious observance of the commandments, so that the punishment for their violation becomes now necessarily more severe; and this is a new *trial*; and, 2nd, that they might bear His fear the deeper in their hearts, and thus be the more effectually protected against sin and unlawful desires. So, then, this divine manifestation was not intended as a terror, but as a new act of love, calculated to promote the true virtue of the people. The Israelites have, with trembling, witnessed the majesty of God; they cannot bear it; fear overpowers them; but this fear was intended by the Almighty; it was designed as a preventive against disobedience, and its next result was the sincere and earnest promise to obey all commands of God, which might be conveyed to them through Moses—*to fear* God, is, here, identical with *to love* Him. This is the connection of these verses (compare note on xix. 3—6). Rabbinical expounders understand נסות thus: "to raise you and make you conspicuous in the world, that your name may be glorified among the nations, because the Almighty Himself revealed Himself to you," and derive נסות from נס, standard, which is *raised up*; but this is both against the etymology and against the context. Rashbam explains, more correctly, להוכיח אתכם, "to warn you." The prefix ל, in לבעבור, indicates the end, *for the purpose of*; the same particle is to be supplied to the following בעבור. The suffix in יראתו, is the *genitivus objectivus*, as in תפלתי, "the prayer *to* me," that is, addressed to me (Isa. lvi. 7); חמסי, "the violence *against* me," that is, committed against me (Jer. li. 35). The Samaritan codex has here, again, considerable additions, taken from Deuteronomy; it mentions, especially, the return of the Israelites to their tents (v. 27), which is, certainly, very probable, but needs not, necessarily, to be related in

תֶּחֱטָאוּ׃ 18 וַיַּעֲמֹד הָעָם מֵרָחֹק וּמֹשֶׁה נִגַּשׁ אֶל־הָעֲרָפֶל אֲשֶׁר־שָׁם
הָאֱלֹהִים׃ ס מפטיר

our text, as all accessory circumstances and events are not always minutely introduced in the holy books (see note on xvi. 22).

18. *And the people stood afar off.* The text returns to ver. 15, in which the immediate effect is described which the revelation had produced on the people; and the assurance and firmness of Moses is placed in conscious opposition to

---

THE BOOK OF THE COVENANT.

ספר הברית

CHAPTERS XX. 19 TO XXIII. 33.

SUMMARY.—After an introductory remark on the appearance of God (xx. 19), follows:

1. A repeated prohibition against making idols (xx. 20).
2. The command that the altars shall be of earth, wood, or *unhewn* stones, and without steps; with which precept God joins the promise that He would bless with His presence His pious servants in every place where they might mention His name (xx. 21—23).—Then follows:

I. *The right of* PERSONS, of free men and of slaves, in all its relations, by intentional or accidental injury (xxi. 1—32); namely:

3. The laws about slaves (xxi. 1—11); viz.:
   a) about those who simply sell themselves to a master for the purpose of serving him, whether they be married or not (xxi. 1—6); and
   b) about such girls whom the fathers sell with the view, and in the hope, that the masters would either themselves take them to wives, or marry them to their sons (xxi. 7—11).
4. The laws about murder (xxi. 12—14); viz.:
   a) about premeditated murder (xxi. 12, 14); and
   b) about unintentional homicide (xxi. 13).
5. Violation of the reverence due to parents (xxi. 15, 17).
6. About *plagium*, or man-stealing (xxi. 16).
7. General personal injury done to a free man (xxi. 18, 19).
8. To a slave (xxi. 20, 21).
9. To a part of the person of a free man (xxi. 22—25).
10. Of a slave (xxi. 26, 27).
11. Injury caused by a beast (xxi. 28—32); viz.:
    a) if the injured person is a free man (xxi. 28—31).
    b) if he is a slave (xxi. 32).

II. *The right of* PROPERTY (xxi. 33—xxii. 14); namely:

12. If it is endangered by *neglect* of others (xxi. 33, 34).
13. If one person's animal is injured by that of another (xxi. 35, 36).
14. Laws about theft (xxi. 37—xxii. 3).
15. About depasturing foreign fields or vineyards (xxii. 4).
16. About damages caused by fire on fields (xxii. 5).
17. About property committed for safe-keeping (xxii. 6—12).
18. About property borrowed from another (xxii. 13, 14).

III. *General* MORAL LAWS, which, however, are deeply connected with the civil organization of the state (xxii. 15—xxiii. 19).

19. About unchastity—stuprum and adulterium (xxii. 15, 16).
20. Law against witchcraft (xxii. 17).
21. Against coition with beasts (xxii. 18).
22. Repetition of the law against polytheism (xxii. 19).
23. Laws concerning the poor, the strangers, widows, and orphans (xxii. 20—23, and xxiii. 9).
24. About loans and interests (xxii. 24).
25. About the right of pledges (xxii. 25, 26).
26. Against disrespect towards God and the authorities (xxii. 27).
27. About the offering of the first-fruits (xxii. 28, 29; xxiii. 19, first part).

may not sin. 18. And the people stood afar off, and Moses drew near to the thick darkness where God *was*.

their trembling and fear. Moses seems, indeed, to have now conquered his diffidence and hesitation so completely, that he, not much later, ventured even the bold wish, that he might be allowed to see the whole glory of God (xxxiii. 18). *Where God was*; Onkelos renders: "where the glory of God was."

---

28. About unlawful meat (xxii. 30).
29. About judicial justice (xxiii. 1—3, and 6—8).
30. About found property (xxiii. 4).
31. Humanity towards animals (xxiii. 5).
32. About the Sabbath and the Sabbath year (xxiii. 10—12).
33. Prohibition against mentioning the name of idols (xxiii. 13).
34. The three principal festivals (xxiii. 14—18).
    a) The Passover (xxiii. 15).
    b) The Feast of Weeks (xxiii. 16).
    c) The Feast of Tabernacles (xxiii. 16).
35. Supplementary law about the Paschal sacrifice (xxiii. 18).
36. The law about the "kid and the milk of its mother" (xxiii. 19, second part).

After the conclusion of these laws follows the exhortation of God, to adhere to them strictly and faithfully, especially to avoid idolatry, and even to destroy the idols wherever they would find them; and, further, the injunction, not to enter into any association with heathen nations; then would God send His messenger before the Israelites; terror will seize the enemies; the promised land will, in due time, come into their possession; they will enjoy health, longevity, and fruitfulness, and extend their country to the Mediterranean Sea in the west, and to the Euphrates in the east (ver. 20—33, see note *ibid*).

Prefatory Remarks.—After the basis of every further legislation had been laid down in the decalogue, and strengthened by some supplementary laws, the holy text proceeds systematically to the other *rights* (משפטים, see on xxi. 1), which, either applicable to the nomadic wanderings through the desert, or, especially, to the organized state of the Hebrews in the promised land, comprise social and individual, religious and political, criminal and civil, divine and human statutes. It is a beautiful scriptural metaphor which describes the union between God and Israel under the sacred image of a matrimonial alliance; God has chosen Israel as His eternal helpmate and friend; Israel has accepted the charge to assist God in spreading on the earth the empire of heaven, and the truth of His law; and the time between the exodus and the conclusion of the covenant on Mount Sinai, may be characterized as the period of the betrothal of God and Israel, their joyful love and faithfulness (compare ii. 2; Eze. xvi. 8; xx. 5; Hos. ix. 10; xi. 1; xiii. 5; Am. ii. 10, etc.; see note on xix. 6). The time has now arrived to strengthen this holy union by stipulations and laws, and to secure its original character by a mutual agreement. But, in order not to oppress the people, at the commencement, with a superabundance of laws and precepts, the wise legislator has, in the following four chapters (xxi—xxiv), premised a summary and compendious survey, and then, slowly and gradually, erected the edifice of the legislation on a steadily widening basis. In this small compass the nucleus of the civil order is included, and such brief outline alone, was, by its systematical limitation, fit to be submitted to the people for adoption and sanction. The "Book of the Covenant," therefore (ספר הברית), which Moses read to the people, with solemn sacrifices, and the contents of which they unanimously promised to fulfil in its whole extent (xxiv. 4, 7), comprises only these sections of the Pentateuch, namely, the decalogue, and the

19 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה כֹּה תֹאמַר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אַתֶּם רְאִיתֶם
כִּי מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם דִּבַּרְתִּי עִמָּכֶם׃ 20 לֹא תַעֲשׂוּן אִתִּי אֱלֹהֵי כֶסֶף וֵאלֹהֵי
זָהָב לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ לָכֶם׃ 21 מִזְבַּח אֲדָמָה תַּעֲשֶׂה־לִּי וְזָבַחְתָּ עָלָיו
אֶת־עֹלֹתֶיךָ וְאֶת־שְׁלָמֶיךָ אֶת־צֹאנְךָ וְאֶת־בְּקָרֶךָ בְּכָל־הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר
אַזְכִּיר אֶת־שְׁמִי אָבוֹא אֵלֶיךָ וּבֵרַכְתִּיךָ׃ 22 וְאִם־מִזְבַּח אֲבָנִים
תַּעֲשֶׂה־לִּי לֹא־תִבְנֶה אֶתְהֶן גָּזִית כִּי חַרְבְּךָ הֵנַפְתָּ עָלֶיהָ וַתְּחַלְלֶהָ׃

laws contained in the following four chapters. They are the תורה in a small epitome, and the following sections of the Pentateuch develop the brief sketch here drawn in its parts and details. The systematic and logical arrangement of these laws will constantly be pointed out in the following notes.

1. Against Idolatry. Vers. 19, 20.

In the decalogue, only the fundamental laws were proclaimed; the specification was reserved to the future care of the legislator. But, in order still more to fortify the basis on which the decalogue rests, the second commandment, which naturally involves the first, is here once more impressively enjoined, namely, to have, or to worship, no other gods besides the God of Israel, nor to represent them in any way by gold or silver images (אתי, like על פני, in ver. 3, or like עמדי, in Gen. iii. 12; Ps. lxxiii. 25); for the pure, spiritual monotheism, formed the corner-stone of the whole religious structure of Mosaism. It is not improbable, that the prohibition in the decalogue refers especially to painting and sculpture, whilst our precept is directed against the molten or cast images (מסכה, or אלהי מסכה, xxxiv. 17; Deut. ix. 12). This exclusive majesty of God is appropriately founded upon the fact, that the Israelites had here witnessed His glory with their own senses, and, although they had heard a voice, they had not perceived a figure. In such invisible grandeur only can the true God of heaven appear; but all the mute idols are vanity. The literal translation of ver. 20, according to the masoretic accents, is: "You shall not make with me; gods of silver and gods of gold you shall not make to you," which is scarcely intelligible, much less logical.

2. About the Construction of the Altars. Ver. 21—23.

In order to remove every occasion and every temptation to relapse into the worship of images, a law was at the very beginning given, which can, in this connection, find its rational explanation only with reference to that idea. The Hebrews were, like all ancient nations, accustomed to sacrifices from the patriarchal times; we find sacrifices of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; sacrifices were the pretext used by Moses to induce Pharaoh to permit the departure of the Hebrews; and Jethro had but just at his arrival offered sacrifices (xviii. 12, where also see about עלות and שלמים). Now, the altars, which were erected for this purpose, were in the heathen rites generally very pompous, elaborated with all embellishments which sculptural art could command: "They were adorned with sculpture, and some were covered with the works of the most celebrated artists of antiquity" (*Smith*, Antiq., p. 116, *b.*). As therefore such ostentatious altars might easily lead to a development of the plastic arts, likely to tempt to the manufacture of idols, it is here commanded to use *altars of earth;* and if later in the holy land, and in settled abodes, altars of stone should be preferred, these stones shall

19. And the Lord said to Moses, thus thou shalt say to the children of Israel, You have seen that I have spoken to you from heaven. 20. You shall not make with me gods of silver, neither shall you make to you gods of gold.

21. An altar of earth thou shalt make to me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt-offerings, and thy thank-offerings, thy sheep, and thy oxen: in all places where I [1]shall let my name be mentioned, I will come to thee, and I will bless thee. 22. And if thou wilt make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone: for if thou lift up thy *iron* tool upon it, thou hast polluted it.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Record my name.

not be hewn, and in general no iron should be applied upon them, but they should be piled up in their natural state without the application of the plastic arts, although these were not altogether excluded from the sanctuaries (see note on ver. 4—6).—This peculiar prohibition might further have its reason in the circumstance, that the unhewn stone, such as it comes from the hands of nature, is most pure, undefiled by human touch and work, and therefore the most appropriate for the sanctity of the altar; and, in fact, the raw stone is the most akin to earth, which was to be the ordinary material for the altar. The application of iron is in our text called a pollution of the altar, because the violent preparation of the material with such instruments appears like an irreverential disregard of the holiness of the intended altar; perhaps also, as Ebn Ezra believes, because the refuse matter of the hewn altar might be used for unworthy purposes.—The Rabbins explain ingeniously: iron abridges life, the altar prolongs it (Midd. 36 *a.*); iron causes destruction and misery, the altar produces reconciliation between God and man; and therefore the use of iron cannot be allowed in making an altar. חרב is, however, any sharp, cutting instrument, from חרב, to destroy (compare חרבות צרים, sharp stones, Josh. v. 2).—An "altar of earth" is one which is formed from green turfs, and is as such most adapted and most convenient for a wandering nation. Among the Romans also we find such altars frequently alluded to, and they were, even in later periods, used on festive occasions (*Hor.* Od. III. viii. 4, 5: "positusque carbo cespite vivo"; *Ovid*, Trist. V. v. 9: "Araque gramineo viridis de cespite fiat." Compare *Metam.* iv. 752; *Lucan.* ix. 988; *Plin.* H. N. v. 4, and according to Tertullian—Apolog. cap. 25—this kind of altar was that in general use).—From the preceding deduction it is clear, that the opinion of Clericus concerning the "altars of earth" is not probable: "As God wished that all the Israelites should assemble at one place to offer their sacrifices, He did not permit, that on any other place altars of a more durable material or of a more elegant workmanship should be erected, fearful lest they allure the mass, who are always attracted by external splendour."—To *mention the name of God* is identical with worshipping Him; for the latter is almost inseparable from the former. See 1 Chron. xvi. 4.—Only if these precepts concerning the nature and construction of the altars are executed, God promises to be near His faithful servants with His aid and His blessing, a sufficient proof what importance is attached to the natural

23 וְלֹא־תַעֲלֶה בְמַעֲלֹת עַל־מִזְבְּחִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִגָּלֶה עֶרְוָתְךָ
עָלָיו׃ פ

simplicity and purity of divine service.—אתהן refers to אבנים, which is feminine.—גזית (from גזה, the same as גזז, to cut) *cut stones*, or completely אבני גזית, 1 Kings v. 31.—בנה is thus here construed with the double accusative, the second of which denotes the *material*, of which the altar is to be made. See note on xii. 39.

23. As the external nature of the altar is here described, the Lawgiver adds another precept with regard to the same subject, in order to secure its holinesss from another side also. As those, who performed the sacerdotal functions, before the introduction of the proper clerical robes (xxviii. 42), wore the usual loose Oriental garments (see on xii. 11) without trowsers, it was ordered, from considerations of decency, that no steps should lead to the altar. And even the breeches of the priests (מכנסים), which as we shall later show did not, like our trowsers, cover the feet entirely, made this command not superfluous (see *Joseph.*, Antiq. III. vii. 1; compare *Talm.*, Nidd. 13 *b*, where the מכנסים are compared with the Roman feminalia). But it has been believed, that the height of the altar, which was generally three cubits (xxvii. 1), made a certain arrangement necessary to facilitate its ascent. The Biblical text makes no allusion to such device; and the tenor of our verse leads us rather to believe, that the officiating priest stood on the ground whilst performing the ceremonies. Everything depends on the length of the cubit, which we shall examine in the remarks on the twenty-fifth chapter. Dif-

פ פ פ

כא 1 וְאֵלֶּה הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים אֲשֶׁר תָּשִׂים לִפְנֵיהֶם׃ 2 כִּי תִקְנֶה עֶבֶד

3. Laws about Slaves. XXI. 1—11.

The very first of the civil laws, that about slavery, exhibits that spirit of moderation and humanity, which is the chief characteristic of the whole legislation; and its very position is significant. In the first commandment the Israelites had been conspicuously reminded of their redemption from slavery; and therefore the first civil law was devoted to the regulation of the condition of the slaves. God had raised the whole nation to free citizens; and, therefore, its every member was destined virtually to enjoy liberty; God was the theocratical Lord of the contemplated Hebrew state, therefore the Israelites should serve *Him* only, but no earthly master. Permanent servitude would have been a revolt against the divine sovereignty: "they are *my* servants, says the Lord, whom I have released from the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold in the manner of eternal slaves" (Lev. xxv. 42).—Thus was *personal liberty* the supreme principle of civil right; and this one idea suffices to comprehend and to appreciate the noble tendency of Mosaism and to distinguish this legislation from all other political systems of antiquity.

In a state, which was entirely based on agriculture and husbandry, slaves were an indispensable requisite, and both strangers and Israelites were employed in such services.

a. Strangers might come into the hand of Hebrew masters: 1. by war, since the captives of war, both males and females, who were not killed, were made slaves (Num. xxxi. 11, 26, 35; Deut. xx. 14; xxi. 10, *et seq.*; compare *St. Hilaire*, on Arist. Polit. i. 30, 31); 2. in peace by purchase (מקנת כסף, ἀργυ-

23. Neither shalt thou go up by steps to my altar, that thy nakedness be not uncovered thereon.

ferent was the case with the altar of the Solomonic temple, which was ten cubits high (2 Chron. iv. 9). However, it appears from Talmudical explanations, that the real altar was indeed but three cubits high (compare also Ezek. xli. 22); but it rested on a base of six cubits, and its horns rose one cubit high. Now, in order to reach the altar itself, not steps were used, in accordance with the precepts of our verse, but a kind of sloping bridge (כבש; see Midd. iii. 1, 3; Erub. x. 14).—Among the Romans also was a similar law, that the flamen dialis should not ascend more than three steps of the altar, unless they were Greek ones, which were enclosed from all sides. *Gellius* (Noct. Attic. lib. x. c. 15), and Servius (ad Æneid iv. 646) observe, with reference to this custom: "Apud veteres Flaminicum plus tribus gradibus nisi Graecas scalas scandere non licebat, ne ulla pars pedum ejus, crurumve subter conspiceretur; eoque nec pluribus gradibus sed tribus ut adscensu duplices nisus non paterentur adtolli vestem, aut nudari crura; nam ideo et scalae Graecae dicuntur, quia ita fabricantur, ut omni ex parte compagine tabularum clausae sint, ne adspectum ad corporis aliquam partem admittant" (see *Rosenm.* ad h. l.).—The Rabbins take this opportunity to deduce, by a conclusion *a fortiori*, the following beautiful principle: "those stones, which have no consciousness to feel the contempt shown them, are by a command of God not to be insulted, since they are of some use; how much more must we take care not to offend any one of our fellow-creatures, who is sensible of a degrading treatment, and who bears the image of our Creator."

CHAP. XXI. 1. Now these *are* the judgments which thou shalt lay before them. 2. [1]When thou [2]acquirest a

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—If. [2] Buy.

ὠνητοί; mancipia argento parata, Livy xli. 6; see Gen. xvii. 23; Exod. xxi. 7; Lev. xxv. 44—46. About their price, see on ver. 32); and 3. the children of such slaves were the property of the master, if they were born in his house (ילידי בית Gen xvii. 23; οἰκότριβες, ver. 4).—Although such foreign slaves were the hereditary property of the master, which passed over to his descendants (Lev. xxv. 46), they were yet in the Mosaic code protected by various important privileges; namely, 1. if they had escaped from their masters, they could not be delivered up to them by the inhabitants of the place where they happened to seek refuge: "he shall dwell with thee, *even* among you, in that place, which he might choose in one of thy gates, where he liketh it best: thou shalt not oppress him" (Deut. xxiii. 16). Quite different was the case among the Romans: "A runaway slave (fugitivus) could not lawfully be received or harboured, to conceal him was *furtum*. The master was entitled to pursue him wherever he pleased; and it was the duty of all authorities to give him aid in recovering the slave" (*Smith*, Antiq., p. 1038). The master was severely punished — according to the Rabbins with death—if he so chastised his slave, that he died on the spot (ver. 20); he forfeited even the slave, if he deprived him of one of the principal members of the body, as an eye or tooth (vers. 26, 27). Thus the slaves were effectually protected against arbitrariness on the part of their masters; which advantage they were far from enjoying among other ancient nations, especially the Romans. "The offences of slaves were punished with severity and frequently with the utmost barbarity. One of the mildest punishments was the removal from the familia

עִבְרִי שֵׁשׁ שָׁנִים יַעֲבֹד וּבַשְּׁבִעִת יֵצֵא לַחָפְשִׁי חִנָּם׃ 3 אִם־בְּגַפּוֹ

urbana to the rustica, where they were obliged to work in fetters. They were frequently beaten with sticks, or scourged with the whip, but these were such every-day punishments, that many slaves ceased almost to care for them.—Slaves were also punished by being hung up by their hands with weights suspended to their feet" (*Smith*, Antiq. p. 1042 *a*; *Becker*, Charikles ii. 48).—A little more protected were the slaves in the Athenian law; for a person who struck or maltreated a slave was liable to an action (ὕβρεως γραφή), nor could a slave be put to death without legal sentence. However, he was not believed upon his oath, and his evidence in courts of justice was always taken with torture (*Smith*, Antiq. p. 1036). 3. The Hebrew slave participated in the usual rest of the Sabbath (Exod. xx. 10; Deut. v. 14, where it is expressly added: "that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou"). 4. He was admitted to the enjoyments of Passover, Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles (Deut. xii. 18; xvi. 11, 14). 5. He could be circumcised after the manner of the Hebrews, and was then permitted to share the paschal-lamb with the family in which he lived (Gen. xvii. 12, 13; Exod. xii. 44). Besides, Michaelis (Mos. R. ii. 130) conjectures, no doubt justly, that from the humane law in Deut. xxv. 4: "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn," it follows, *a fortiori*, that the servants and hirelings of every kind, who were employed at the harvest or the gathering of fruits, were allowed to eat thereof according to their pleasure; it would, indeed, be a Tantalus-like torture, to let the labourer starve in the midst of surrounding superfluity. The hardened sinner and miser is thus described by Job: "Hungry labourers carry his sheaves, within the walls of his workhouses they make oil, they tread the wine-press and suffer thirst" (Job xxiv. 10, 11; compare also *Talm.*, Bab. Mez. fol. 83).—So was then even the foreign slave treated with humane consideration in the Mosaic law.

b) But Hebrews (עברים) also might fall into slavery, by the following contingencies: 1. If they sold themselves in consequence of poverty (Levit. xxv. 39; Deut. xv. 12). As the legal price of a slave, thirty silver shekels are mentioned (xxi. 32), whilst a free Israelite was valued at fifty shekels (Lev. xxvii. 3, *et seq.*). The lowest price of a Jewish slave was 120 drachmas (*Joseph.*, Antiq. XII. ii. 3). About the price of Greek slaves see *Xenophon*, Memor. ii. 5, 2; and of Roman slaves *Smith*, Antiq., p. 1040, *b*. 2. If a father sold his daughter to an Israelitish master (vers. 7—11). 3. If a convicted thief was unable to pay the legal compensation for his theft (xxii. 2, 3), in which case, however, he could only be sold to an Israelite, and for a period not exceeding six years (*Joseph.*, Antiq. XVI. i. 1). If the jubilee took place within this time, he was then already released (*Joseph.*, Antiq. III. xii. 13). 4. The children of a man-servant and a maid-servant, whom the former had married in the house of the master (verse 4). Sometimes debtors or their children may have been addicted, *de facto*, as slaves to the creditors (2 Kings iv. 1); but this was evidently against the intention of the Mosaic law, which contains no provision on this point (see note to xx. 4—6, p. 351).

Now the treatment and the rights of these Hebrew servants were not regulated after mere feelings of philanthropy; but they received, in conformity with the theocratical principle already referred to, a firmer and more permanent *political* basis. The Hebrew servant was not considered as a *thing*, not as a property for ever lost to the interests of the community. There exists in Hebrew no word for *slave* in the sense of an individual who is considered merely as an instrument; the word עבד means merely *labourer*; and the most privileged favourites of God are called עבדי יי׳, so Moses and the prophets, and the people of Israel

Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve; and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing. 3. If he came

itself (Isaiah xliv. 2; Jer. xxx. 10, etc.). Even whilst a servant he did not lose his rights as a citizen of the state, and his civil privileges were only suspended, not cancelled. For the law ordains: "When thou acquirest a Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve; and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing" (ver. 2); or in Deut. xv. 12: "And if thy brother, a Hebrew man, or a Hebrew woman, be sold to thee, and serve thee six years, then in the seventh year thou shalt let him go free from thee;" to which is added, in Lev. xxv. 41: "And then shall he depart from thee, both he and his children with him, and shall return to his own family, and to the possession of his fathers shall he return." As, therefore, the servitude of a Hebrew was, in every case, only *temporary*, he must be considered rather as a *hireling*, than as a *slave*; and thus the holy text, indeed, calls him: "And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee becomes poor, and sells himself to thee, thou shalt not compel him *to serve as a bond servant* (לא תעבוד בו עבודת עבד): but as *a hired servant* and as a sojourner (כשכיר כתושב) he shall be with thee" (Lev. xxv. 39, 40); and it needs, after these remarks, scarcely be mentioned, that he was allowed to acquire property for himself, independent of the control of his master, and that he could redeem himself with it, even before the lapse of the six years (Lev. xxv. 40). Not so among the Romans, who considered it as a rule of the *jus gentium*, that a slave could have no property, for all his acquisitions belonged to his master (Gaius, i. 52). From all this follows, as a natural consequence, the obligation to treat the Hebrew servant with the leniency and consideration due to a fellow-citizen, who is sure to be re-instated into all his civil rights: "Thou shalt not rule over him with rigour, but shalt fear thy God" (Lev. xxv. 43). The legislator has even provided for the case, that a rich non-Israelitish stranger or sojourner buys a poor Hebrew as his slave; in such emergencies the duty devolves upon the relatives of the latter to redeem him even with the greatest personal sacrifices: "let him not be ruled over with rigour in thy sight." But, if he has no relatives capable of redeeming him, he shall at least in the year of jubilee go out free with his children: "For to me the children of Israel are servants; they are my servants whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; I am the Lord your God" (Lev. xxv. 47—55). The duty to release a slave who serves in the house of a *Hebrew* master is not enjoined, because the former was, in this case, sure of humane treatment, which could not be expected from a heathen master.

From these deductions, two disputed points in connection with the legislation concerning slaves, find their easy solution: 1st, whether, by the expression עבד עברי (ver. 2), an *Israelitish* servant, is to be understood, or, generally, one of the descendants of Eber, or of one of the trans-Euphratic tribes, that is, Ishmaelites, Ammonites, Moabites, Midianites, etc. But, undoubtedly, *Israelitish* servants are meant; for *a.* the Israelites only have been delivered from Egyptian captivity (Levit. xxv. 53; Deut. xv. 15); *b.* they only could be called the servants of God (*ibid.*) in a time when all other nations were sunk in the abominations of idolatry; *c.* Jeremiah (xxxiv. 9), alluding to the release of the slaves, explains, distinctly, the phrase עבד עברי by עבד יהודי, as also, according to Rashi, the word אחיך, in Levit. xv. 39, 46, and Deut. xv. 12, refers to Israelites; compare Jonah i. 9; *d.* according to Levit. xxv. 44, the Israelites are permitted to take slaves for life from the nations around them; but these are mostly descendants of Eber or Abraham, as the Ishmaelites, Midianites, Edomites, etc. Therefore these nations cannot, in our passage, be included in the name of *Hebrews* (com-

יָבֹא בְּגַפּוֹ יֵצֵא אִם־בַּעַל אִשָּׁה הוּא וְיָצְאָה אִשְׁתּוֹ עִמּוֹ׃ 4 אִם־

pare Ebn Ezra, on ver. 2). The weak arguments in favour of the contrary opinion, have been dropped by Michaelis himself, who had formerly adhered to it (*loc. cit.* p. 274). 2nd, In our passage, and in Deut. xv. 12, the time of service is fixed at six years, whilst in Levit. xxv. 40, it is extended to the year of jubilee. This is easily to be reconciled, by the explanation, that the Hebrew servant becomes, *in all cases*, free, in the year of jubilee, even if this should happen to take place *before* the lapse of the six years of service. For the seventh year, of which Moses speaks as the year of the regular release of Hebrew slaves, is not the Sabbath-year, but, according to Maimonides (Hilch. Abodah, ii. 2), the seventh after the commencement of their servitude; so that the Sabbath-year had no influence upon the condition and relations of the slaves. Thus remarks Josephus (Antiq. XVI. i. 1), quite generally, that the Hebrew slaves became free μετὰ ἑπταέτην, after seven years; and, in Genesis already (xxix), the period of seven years is adopted as the ordinary extent of the service of a slave.

But the mildness towards the Hebrew servant was not limited to the period of his service only, but extended to the very moment of his release; he was not to be dismissed empty: "Thou shalt furnish him liberally out of thy flock, and out of thy floor, and out of thy wine-press: of that wherewith the Lord thy God hath blessed thee thou shalt give to him." This is commanded as a duty of gratitude to God, who mercifully released the Israelites from Egyptian bondage, and who did not let them leave it "empty," but loaded with rich and precious presents (Deut. xv. 15; Exod. iii. 21, 22). And the gratuitous release of the Hebrew slave is enjoined to the Israelites with the most emphatical, soul-stirring words: "for the Lord thy God will bless thee in all that thou doest" (Deut. xv. 18). If the servant came into the house of his master as a single, unmarried man (בגפו), he goes out alone; if he was married, his wife shares with him the right of liberty (ver. 3). But, "if his master giveth him a wife, and she beareth him sons or daughters; the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself" (ver. 4). However, as, according to Deut. xv. 12, 17, the maid-servant entirely participates in all the rights and duties of a man-servant, it is probable that our text speaks of *Canaanitish* women, whom the master gives to the servants, and who, being illegitimate wives, according to the Mosaic law, do not accompany them into the condition of freedom.

But the cases were not impossible, that a slave, after a service of six years, estranged from all his former connections, and incapable of maintaining his independence, preferred to remain with his master, dear to him, perhaps, by custom, affection and gratitude. He might, besides, have married a Canaanitish maid-servant of his master, and, as she and her children remained always in the house of the master (ver. 4), love to his family induced him, perhaps, to prefer servitude to liberty. Such feelings are natural, and, from the ordinary point of view, well justifiable. But such practice would, in two essential points, have been in direct opposition with the leading principle of the Mosaic theocracy. It would, firstly, in the lapse of time, have produced a large multitude of dependent slaves of Israelitish descent, and, instead of a community of free citizens, with equal rights, the state would, in a few centuries, have been divided into a governing and a serving part, to its own deep degradation. Thus were, in Attica, according to the census made when Demetrius Phalereus was archon (B.C. 309), 21,000 free citizens, and not less than 400,000 slaves, (although many of the latter might have been of foreign origin, and the numbers may be in some degree corrupted). But it would, secondly, soon have destroyed the supreme sovereignty of God as the

in by himself, he shall go out by himself; if he was married, then his wife shall go out with him. 4. If his

only Lord of *all* Israelites, and would have reduced a numerous class of born Hebrews into a state of submission which could not but disturb the pure and immediate relation between God and His people; and, further, intermarriages with heathens were not to be encouraged; the theocratical legislator could not respect a tie which was calculated to operate injuriously on the religious ideas of the slave.

Those servants, therefore, who, after six years of service, disdained the liberty, and thus preferred the sovereignty of men to that of God, were ordered to be brought before the judges (האלהים); and, as a lasting ignominy, their ear was to be perforated with an awl at the door or its posts, and then they remained the slaves of their masters for all their lives (לעולם, see on ver. 6). Certainly, the practice of perforating the ears of slaves was a custom in use among many nations of antiquity. Thus, a freedman says, in Juvenal (Sat. i. 103):

"Cur timeam dubitemve locum defendere, quamvis
Natus ad Euphratem, molles quod in aure fenestrae
Arguerint, licet ipse negem?"

"And I, in spite
Of your great lordships' will, maintain my right:
Though born a slave, though my torn ears are bored,
'Tis not the birth, 'tis money makes the lord."—(*Dryden's Translation*).

However, the same was done to children, who were, by their parents, consecrated to the service of a deity (see *Xenophon*, Anab. III. i. 21; *Plutarch*, Sympos. II. 1, 4; compare *Rosenmüller*, Orient, ii, p. 69, *et seq.*). Further, even now, many Orientals perforate their ears, in order to wear ear-rings. But, with these ornaments much superstition was formerly connected; they served as amulets, which, sacred to the gods, were believed to keep off from the ears all evil enchantments. It is, therefore, not impossible, that the legislator, by branding the perforated ear as a disgrace, wished to prevent such superstition, and, in the course of time, abolish it, in which endeavour he seems, indeed, in this indirect manner, to have succeeded (see *Michael. loc. cit.* p. 277; compare, however, *Plaut.* Phoen. V. ii. 21). As parallel customs, we mention, that the Roman slaves were manumitted in three different modes: 1st, by *vindicta* (see *infra*); 2nd, by *census*, that is, if the slave, at the lustral census, gave in his property at the bidding of his master; and, 3rd, by *testament* of his master. As the Mosaic law prescribes a certain ceremony if a servant is destined to perpetual slavery, so a certain form was followed in the most common manner of manumission, that per vindictam; and it is described as follows: "The master brought his slave before the magistrates, and stated the grounds of the intended manumission. The lictor of the magistrates laid a rod (fetusca) on the head of the slave, accompanied with certain formal words, in which he declared that he was a free man, ex jure Quiritium. The master, in the meantime, held the slave, and, after he had pronounced the words: 'hunc hominem liberum volo,' he turned him round, and let him go (emisit e manu), whence the general term of the act of manumission" (*Smith*, Dict. of Antiq. p. 730).

7—11. A law follows concerning maid-servants, which, compared with Deut. xv. 17, offers, at first glance, a peculiar difficulty; but it disappears at a closer examination. According to that passage in Deuteronomy, the maid-servant is to obtain her liberty like the man-servant, in the seventh year, and, if she declines it, she is to be marked with the same sign of servitude as the latter; whereas, according to our passage, "she shall not go out as the men-servants do," quite different regulations are enjoined concerning her release. But the recon

אֲדֹנָיו יִתֶּן־לוֹ אִשָּׁה וְיָלְדָה־לוֹ בָנִים אוֹ בָנוֹת הָאִשָּׁה וִילָדֶיהָ
תִּהְיֶה לַאדֹנֶיהָ וְהוּא יֵצֵא בְגַפּוֹ׃ 5 וְאִם־אָמֹר יֹאמַר הָעֶבֶד
אָהַבְתִּי אֶת־אֲדֹנִי אֶת־אִשְׁתִּי וְאֶת־בָּנָי לֹא אֵצֵא חָפְשִׁי׃ 6 וְהִגִּישׁוֹ

ciliation is simply this. In general, the laws about man-servants are, in their whole extent, applicable to maid-servants also. But there was a peculiar class of the latter, whom the father sold to a master, in order to serve him as a consort of second rank. Now, if the master granted her these connubial rights, or if he gave her to his son in the same quality, she remained for ever in his house, without becoming free after six years; for, in the former case, she enjoys the rights of a wife, in the second, those of a daughter; and her position is in no manner to be compared with that of ordinary maid-servants. The only differences between such alliances and legal marriages, are, perhaps, that they are concluded without the usual presents (מהר), and dissolved without a letter of divorce. The offspring of both have equal rights, with regard to their position in the family and to inheritance. (Comp. Deut. xxi. 10—14). But, if neither the master, nor one of his sons, performed to her the promised duties, he had not the right to sell her to another master, "since he had dealt deceitfully with her," and she goes out free immediately, without being bound to wait to the seventh year. We can, therefore, not approve of the opinion of Michaelis, Jahn, Rosenmüller, Hävernick, and others, that Moses himself had later altered the law, and placed the maid-servants in every respect on an equal footing with the man-servants. But their rights are, in fact, identical; the Pentateuch is in perfect harmony with itself; for our text does not speak of common maid-servants, but of quite a different kind of females. Nor does our text treat, as the Rabbins believe, of young girls who have not yet attained the age of puberty. Not the remotest allusion confirms such conception. That polygamy, after the universal custom of the East, was not interdicted by Moses, although he did not favour it, is well known (see note on xx. 13, p. 370).

1. משפטים, statutes, or laws, after which *judgment* is to be pronounced; therefore is this word naturally applied to such ordinances only as admit of a different opinion, for instance, concerning the right of slaves, strangers, etc., but not the Ten Commandments, which, as *principles* of morality, are incontrovertible, and equally acknowledged by all men. Anselm Bayley defines, therefore, משפטים correctly, as "moral laws or duties of society, arising from custom and mutual convenience." Some commentators derive משפט from שבט, "tribe," because the head of the family (שבט) was, at the same time, its judge. But שפט seems to be a primitive verb, nor does any derivative of שבט occur in the signification of *judging*. תשים, Targ. Onk. תסדר, to arrange, to display. Compare xix. 7.

2. According to Ebn Ezra, the specified legislation begins with the laws concerning the slaves, because there is no bitterer lot, than to stand in the power and under the will of a fellow-man. (See, however, *supra*, p. 380).—עבד עברי, an *Israelitish* servant. The distinction which Saalschütz (Mos. R. p. 702—708) establishes between Hebrew citizens, who are sold as servants for debts or similar reasons, and such slaves, as were already before in such dependent condition, and were descendants of heathen parents or ancestors, is artificial, and is not recognised by the Rabbins; it cannot be based on the expression עבד עברי, which means clearly a Hebrew servant, whether he is of Israelitish origin or not; and, in Jeremiah xxxiv. 9, the terms עברי and יהודי are used synonymously. Our passage must be reconciled with Leviticus xxv. 39—43, in the manner explained above, p. 383.—*In the seventh year*, after

master giveth him a wife, and she beareth him sons or daughters; the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself. 5. But if the servant will firmly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free: 6. Then his master shall

the commencement of the servitude, not in the Sabbath year.— לחפשי, free, from חָפַשׁ, solutus, liber fuit, thence חֹפֶשׁ, libertas (=חָפְשָׁה, Levit. xix. 20), therefore, with the adjective termination ִי, it forms חָפְשִׁי. Others believe this word to be a substantive, identical with חפשית, after the analogy of מרבית or תרבית. Michaelis asserts strangely (*loc. cit.* p. 272), that חפשי signifies, originally, the *impure*, the slave who was manumitted on account of his leprosy!—The preposition ל in לחפשי is, according to Ewald (Gr. § 544, *loc. cit.*), to be explained from the idea of *motion* being involved in the phrase יצא לחפשי, "he goes out into the state of a free man." But in ver. 5, the same phrase occurs without ל: אצא חפשי. The conjunction כי is, *when*, whilst אם is, *if*; therefore is כי used in the two principal sentences, vers. 2 and 7, whilst אם is employed in the subordinate cases, vers. 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11.—About the Rabbinical acceptation of these laws, see Kiddushin, fol. 14; where a difference is established in the treatment of those who have sold themselves and those who are sold by the judges.

3. בגפו, originally, "with his own body," that is, *alone*; Septuagint, μόνος; *Onkelos*, בלחודוהי, cælebs, sine uxore et liberis. גַּף is connected with גֵּו, גַּו, גְּוִיָּה, body.—Quite untenable is the opinion of those who take here גף in an Aramaic sense, like כָּנָף, "the border of a garment." Thus translates the Vulgate: "cum quali veste intraverat, cum tali exeat." Ebn Ezra also mentions this opinion, which he, however, rejects.—*The man of a wife*, namely, of *Hebrew* descent. —*Then his wife shall go out with him*; from which words the Talmud (Kiddush. 22) infers the humane injunction: "he who buys a Hebrew servant is bound to support his wife and children also." It seems probable, from the context of these verses, that such servants are here alluded to, who have sold themselves with their wives, since it appears unjust, that the wife shall suffer servitude for the debts, and, perhaps, for the theft of her husband.

4. *If his master give him a wife*, namely, one of *Canaanitish* origin; for the Israelitish maid-servant went out free in the seventh year. The clause, that such wives shall remain in the house of the master together with their offspring, is not mentioned in the parallel passage, Deut. xv. 12—18.—אֲדֹנָיו his master, instead of אֲדֹנוֹ. The pluralis majestatis is sometimes used of this word, אֲדֹנִים קשה a severe lord. Isaiah xix. 14.

5. ואם אמר יאמר. If the slave says resolutely and firmly.

6. אל־האלהים Onk. לקדם דיניא, before the *judges*, and so almost all interpreters; for the judges pronounce the sentence in the name of the deity. That the Israelites, like the Egyptians (Diod. Sic. i. 90), honoured the judges like gods, as Michaelis believes (Mos. R. § 35, 2), and called them, therefore, אלהים; of such a notion we have no trace whatever. Compare xxii. 8, 27; Deut. i. 17, etc. Sept. πρὸς τὸ κριτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ, "ad tribunal Dei," which circumlocution expresses the sense correctly. Abarbanel, and after him Rosenmüller, Gesenius, and others believe, that the judges are sometimes called אלהים, because the courts of justice were in *holy places*, where God was enthroned (comp. Deut. xix. 17), which opinion is, essentially, little different from the reason above assigned; for certainly the judges are, in some respects, the *mouth* of the deity. On the other hand, the judges did not always fulfil

אֲדֹנָיו אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים וְהִגִּישׁוֹ אֶל־הַדֶּלֶת אוֹ אֶל־הַמְּזוּזָה וְרָצַע אֲדֹנָיו
אֶת־אָזְנוֹ בַּמַּרְצֵעַ וַעֲבָדוֹ לְעֹלָם׃ ס 7 וְכִי־יִמְכֹּר
אִישׁ אֶת־בִּתּוֹ לְאָמָה לֹא תֵצֵא כְּצֵאת הָעֲבָדִים׃ 8 אִם־רָעָה
בְּעֵינֵי אֲדֹנֶיהָ אֲשֶׁר־לֹא יְעָדָהּ וְהֶפְדָּהּ לְעַם נָכְרִי לֹא־יִמְשֹׁל לְמָכְרָהּ

לו ק׳ ◦

their functions in sacred places, at least not when performing such ceremonies as perforating the ear of the servant; for the usage was that the judges sat at the gates of the town, or other free places open to public access. "It was a general custom in the East," remarks Dr. Paxton (Illustrations of Scripture, ii. p. 455), "to brand their slaves in the forehead, as being the most exposed, and sometimes in other parts of the body. The common way of stigmatizing was by burning the member with a red-hot iron, marked with certain letters, till a fair impression was made, and then pouring ink into the furrows, that the inscription might be more conspicuous. Slaves were often branded with marks or letters, as a punishment for their offences; but the most common design of these marks was to distinguish them if they should desert their masters."—לעולם is simply explained by Rashbam: "all the days of his life," as in 1 Sam. i. 22: וישב שם עד עולם. Compare *ibid.* vers. 11, 28: כל ימי חייו. This is, certainly, the most obvious interpretation. But, according to the Rabbins, לעולם signifies only to the year of jubilee, when even the voluntary servant is to be restored to liberty; and Ebn Ezra remarks, in support of this opinion: "לעולם means merely a *long* time (as in the above passage from Samuel); and none of all Israelitish periods of time is longer than the jubilee, and the return to liberty is, for the slave, like the *renewal* of the world" (see note on xii. 14). It must be allowed that this opinion stands in harmony with the principal idea, that in the year of jubilee *all* relations of persons and property assumed their original condition (see Lev. xxv. 41), and that the slave might thus come into possession of his ancestral property. But he has forfeited this right of a free citizen by spontaneously submitting to the yoke of slavery. And the same reasons which induced the slave to remain in the house of his master in the seventh year of his service, operated with still greater force in the year of jubilee. The expression "to serve for ever" (לעלם) is in Lev. xxv. 46, used of non-Israelitish servants, who shall be inherited by the children and are, indisputably, a *permanent* property of the master, who has no obligation to release them. Where the text intends a service to the jubilee it employs not indistinctly עד עולם, but the clear term עד שנת היבל, in Lev. xxv. 40. From this passage, it is further evident that service to the jubilee was not considered ignominious; the degradation of the servant began only if he did not claim his liberty even after that epoch.—According to the Talmudists, the *doorposts* were selected for that act, because, marked as they were with the blood of the paschal-lamb, they were the first witnesses of the divine redemption and sovereignty; and the *ear* was to be perforated, because it had heard: "You are *my* servants, and not the servants of servants, and yet do not obey" (see, however, *supra*). After the analogy of xxix. 20 they further assert, that the *right* ear received that degrading mark. However, the *doorposts* might have been chosen in order to denote the permanent relation to the *house* of the master; and the *ear* was perforated as a symbolical sign of the obedience which the servant promises to his master for all future time (compare Psa. xl. 7). The act of perforation was performed publicly and before the judges, in order to prevent, as Michaelis cor-

bring him to the judges, and shall bring him to the door, or to the door-post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him for ever.

7. And when a man selleth his daughter to be a maid-servant, she shall not go out as the men-servants do. 8. If she pleaseth not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed: to sell her to [1]strange people he shall have no power, since he hath

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—A strange nation.

rectly remarks, masters from pretending, contrary to truth, that their servants had promised to serve them during their lives; and, further, lest a master extort, by threats, such promise from the servant during the years of his servitude.

7. About the law of vers. 7—11 see *supra.* לאמה is here rather concubine, than maid-servant (see p. 386).

8. If the master dislikes the maid-servant "whom he has betrothed to himself" (אשר לו [לא] יעדה) he shall let her be redeemed (והפדה); for he had bought her from her father only under the condition, and with the promise, to live with her in conjugal intercourse. But he was not permitted to sell her to a stranger (לעם נכרי), since he has dealt deceitfully with her (בבגדו־בה); for by refusing to her the rights of a wife of second rank, he treacherously breaks the promise given to her father. Hence it follows: 1. The Keri לו יעדה, not the Ketib לא, is the correct reading; so translates Onkelos, דיקימה ליה, "whom he had appointed for himself," and the Vulg. "*cui tradita fuerat;*" so also Rashi, Ebn Ezra, Nachmanides, De Wette, Winer, Zunz, and others. The different codices of the Septuagint disagree with each other. The Ketib לא, which has been defended by some critics, as Mendelssohn, Rosenmüller, Herxheimer, Salomon, and others yields by no means so unforced and natural a sense: "so that he does not appoint her for himself." 2. לעם נכרי signifies, generally, to somebody else; according to Saadiah עם נכרי is identical with איש נָכְרִי, and Onkelos already translates: לגבר אוחרן; for in the Mosaic law it was forbidden, in general, to sell an Israelite to a *foreign nation*, as Josephus (Antiq. XVI. i. 1) very distinctly and emphatically observes. Compare Talmud, Kiddush., fol. 18. The addition בבגדו בה shows, therefore, a gradation of the sense: that he shall not even have the right to sell her to another master. Maimonides, Abarbanel, and, after them several others, explain thus: "The *father* shall not have the right to sell his daughter to a *foreign nation*." But against this interpretation must be remarked: 1. The subject to ימשל can only be that of the whole sentence, and that is the *master*, not the *father*, who is not mentioned in the whole verse. 2. The words בבגדו בה must, in that case, be translated: "since he (the father) by selling her to a non-Israelite, *would act* deceitfully against her," which conditional sense cannot be implied in the simple infinitive בבגדו. That עם נכרי in the signification of stranger is not against the spirit of the Hebrew language, is probable from the translation of Onkelos, and has been fully proved by S. D. Luzzato and others; it is, in fact, literally, *strange* people; which does not exclude *Israelites.*—יעד to appoint; therefore מועד appointed season. והפדה has, as Ebn Ezra observes, a causative meaning: "he shall try to effect her redemption," and Rashi explains: "he shall *facilitate* her release." בגד to be faithless, especially in matrimonial duties. Comp. Malach. ii. 14.

9. *And if he hath betrothed her to his son*, etc. In the East, where under the

בְּבִגְדוֹ־בָהּ׃ 9 וְאִם־לִבְנוֹ יִיעָדֶנָּה כְּמִשְׁפַּט הַבָּנוֹת יַעֲשֶׂה־לָּהּ׃
10 אִם־אַחֶרֶת יִקַּח־לוֹ שְׁאֵרָהּ כְּסוּתָהּ וְעֹנָתָהּ לֹא יִגְרָע׃ 11 וְאִם־
שְׁלָשׁ־אֵלֶּה לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה לָהּ וְיָצְאָה חִנָּם אֵין כָּסֶף׃ ס 12 מַכֵּה

influence of the burning climate the young men attain their puberty often earlier than the circumstances permit them to form matrimonial alliances, it is customary, that the parents, in order to obviate more dangerous excesses, give to their sons a maid-servant, whom they keep till their legal marriage, and who is then sent into a seraglio, whilst her children remain in the paternal house and are there educated. If the marriage proves barren, those children may even inherit the property of their father. (Compare *Chardin*, Travels iii. p. 293; *Michaelis*, M. R. ii. 89). The Mosaic rite is advantageously distinguished from these customs in one very essential point, that the concubine was even after the marriage of the son not heartlessly rejected, but was treated with every consideration like a daughter-in-law (כמשפט הבנות). For she received even then—

10. *a.* שארה her food (שאר originally only flesh, Sept. τὰ δέοντα); *b.* כסותה her apparel, and *c.* ענתה conjugal cohabitation (Sept. τὴν ὁμιλίαν αὐτῆς; according to others, like מעון habitation); she was, therefore, in many respects, treated like a wife.

11. If this was not done, if those three points were not granted to her, she became *eo ipso*, free without redemption; for the master had violated the condition of the purchase.—Most of the Jewish interpreters refer the words "these three things" quite generally to the preceding cases; namely, if the master does not betroth her to himself, nor gives her to his son, nor lets her be redeemed. But it is by far preferable to understand, with Abarbanel and others, the three things mentioned immediately before. Those three cases are, in our text, by no means distinguished clearly enough to offer themselves as readily to the mind of the reader as the three conditions of שארה כסותה וענתה. Moreover, the third case would be singularly indistinct: she goes out free, if the master does not let her be redeemed;—when? how long after the beginning of her servitude? and how far are his exertions for her redemption legally required?—חנם אין כסף, *free without money*. אין כסף is an explanatory addition to חנם, like כי מת אתה ולא תחיה, 2 Kings xxi. 1.

These are the laws concerning servants; they deserve equal admiration on account of their efficiency and of their humanity; the former manifests itself in its harmony with the fundamental principles of Mosaism: personal liberty and exclusive subordination under God as the real Lord; the latter shows itself in the character of those laws, which are framed with constant attention to the interests of the servants. However, these excellent laws seem to have been but very imperfectly executed. For at the time of king Zedekiah, the prophet Jeremiah ordered, by the command of God, the tribes of Israel to let free the servants, in accordance with the Mosaic statutes. In the first impulse of enthusiasm they obeyed the command of the prophet; but after a short time they compelled their former slaves to return to the old yoke. Then the prophet complains, that their fathers also had not heeded these laws, nor given their heart to them; and thus they walked but in the wicked ways of their ancestors; and he adds one of the most rigorous admonitions and menaces, foretelling the complete extirpation of Judah. So important did the prophet justly consider these laws concerning the rights of servants (see Jer. xxxiv. 8—22).—In order to show the high dignity of these precepts in a still more striking manner, we observe, how far remote even the wisest and greatest philosophers and legislators of pagan antiquity were from such humane

dealt deceitfully with her. 9. And if he hath betrothed her to his son, he shall do to her after the manner of daughters. 10. If he taketh for him another *wife*, her food, her raiment, and her conjugal right, shall he not diminish. 11. And if he doth not these three to her, then shall she go out free without money.—12. He that

notions. Aristotle defines a slave to be: "a living working-tool and possession" (ὁ δοῦλος ἔμψυχον ὄργανον, Eth. Nic. viii. 13; κτῆμά τι ἔμψυχον, Polit. i. 4); the same distinguished philosopher goes even so far as to divide mankind into two different races: the free, and *those who are slaves by nature* (οἱ φύσει δοῦλοι), whilst Mosaism establishes the natural equality of *all* as the very first of its fundamental principles. Other comparisons have been interspersed in the preceding remarks. Even foreign slaves were not unfrequently made heirs of the property of their Hebrew masters who had no sons (compare Gen. xv. 2, 3; 1 Chron. ii. 34, 35; so also Job xxxi. 13, 14); and the Gibeonites who were, for a flagrant fraud, made hereditary servants of the sanctuary, seem to have enjoyed a considerable amount of regard (Josh. ix. 26, 27; compare 2 Sam. xxi, 3, *et seq.*). It appears, in fact, from a close examination of the Mosaic laws about slavery, that the legislator was deeply impressed with the numberless evils and degradations with which that condition is attended; and that he would fainly have abolished it altogether had the notions of his time and his people allowed it. A wise conformation to existing feelings and popular preconceptions pervades the whole Mosaic legislation; and if the top of this tree reaches into the serene heights of heaven, its roots are hidden in the earth. This principle of accommodation to old forms is a tribute which the lawgiver paid to humanity; but he infused a new spirit into those old forms, and converted thus prejudices into truths, and abuses into blessings. We shall, in the following law, have another very remarkable instance of that principle.—Ewald finds, in the course of Hebrew history, a sort of subordinate persons, who stand in the midst between slaves and free hirelings, and calls them *clients*, with a similar relation to their *patrons* as the Roman clients. But the instances and arguments, which he adduces, are not decisive; and what he calls clients, seem only to be the chief or superintending slaves in the houses of the rich. It may, lastly, be observed, that some critics (as Bertheau and others) have, in these precepts concerning slavery, as in several other instances, found ten different laws (which are indeed discernible), and attach to this circumstance some importance, ten being a significant number, which recalls the sanctity of the decalogue.

4. Laws about Murder. Vers. 12—14.

The laws about murder are here but briefly, though clearly and comprehensively, treated; the following passages contain the more minute provisions: vers. 20, 21, 28, 29; Numb. xxxv, 9—34; Deut. xix. 1—14; Levit. xxiv. 17, 21; Deut. iv. 41—44; compare Deut. xxi. 1—9; xxvii. 24, 25; Josh. xx.; 2 Sam. xiv. A careful comparison and combination of these passages will exhibit a legislative system concerning homicide, in which manly severity is surprisingly coupled with humanity, and principle with expediency. Two leading ideas are easily discoverable: the perfect equality of all before the law, and a degree of respect and reverence for human life, which elevates this part of the legislation almost from criminal to moral laws. They solve the great problem of com-

אִישׁ וָמֵת מוֹת יוּמָת׃ 13 וַאֲשֶׁר לֹא צָדָה וְהָאֱלֹהִים אִנָּה לְיָדוֹ

bining safety and order with the greatest possible consideration and justice; and, in order to attain this aim, they are either prudently based on prevailing popular notions, or composed of new institutions energetically introduced. Those laws are naturally divided into two very different sections, namely: I. against premeditated murder: and, II. against unintentional *manslaughter*, or excusable *homicide*.

I. Murder, deliberate and prepense, was, in every case, punished with death, and the same laws applied, in this respect, to the Israelite and the foreigner (Levit. xxiv. 22). To take redemption-money for such crime, as is the case among the Mohammedans, was not permitted; thus the rich murderer would have obtained a dangerous prerogative over the poorer criminal, and the principle of equality would have been destroyed. The murderer was cursed. Even from the altar, which was, in ancient times, the usual asylum of criminals, he could be taken and delivered up to death (see on ver. 14). The land was considered desecrated and polluted as long as the blood of the murderer had not been shed, and the dwelling-place of God seemed disgraced (see p. 367). So great was the horror against bloodshed, that even animals which had killed a person, were stoned, and their flesh was prohibited; the only end of such extraordinary precept was, to fill the people with deeper aversion to every sanguinary deed (see on ver. 28—32). If a corpse was found, and the murderer was unknown, and could by no effort be discovered, the elders of the nearest town killed, at a perennial river, a calf, which had not yet borne a yoke, and, washing their hands in the stream, in the presence of the Levites, the servants of God, pronounced the following solemn words: "Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Be merciful, O Lord, to Thy people Israel, whom Thou hast redeemed, and lay not innocent blood to Thy people of Israel's charge. And the blood shall be forgiven them" (Deut. xxi. 1—9); and this is, again, a symbolical, impressive ceremony, to enjoin the sanctity of human life, even to the most untutored minds. The legislator ordered even, that the flat roofs of the houses, which are, in the East, much used, both by day and by night, should be surrounded with a parapet or battlement (מעקה), lest anybody fall down, and the proprietor bring blood over his house (Deut. xxii. 8). To keep poison, was, according to the Rabbins, interdicted, and if it was found in any Israelite's house, he suffered death (*Josephus*, Antiq. IV. viii. 34), which law they inferred from xxii. 17, understanding מכשפה as *a poisoner*. The deeper motive of all these laws has already been pointed out in our explanation of the sixth commandment; namely, because man is not only a living being, in whose blood is the soul, but is created in the image of God (Gen. ix. 6). But the *intention* of murder must be clear beyond any doubt. If the criminal lay in ambush for his victim, with a known malice in his heart; if he smote him with instruments, which manifestly show an intention of murder, whether they are of iron, or stone, or wood, he was considered a murderer; but at least two or three (that is, several) witnesses were required to prove the deed legally. In Deut. xix. 11, five conditions are specified, which, only when combined, constitute assassination: 1st, hatred against the fellow-man: 2nd, lying in wait for him: 3rd, the assault against him: 4th, smiting him with a mortal instrument or in a mortal manner: and, 5th, actual death.

II. But, if no intention of homicide was obvious, and death ensued from any uncontrollable cause, without the motives of hatred or malice, capital punishment would, after the just conception of the legislator, have been a crime, it would be "guilt of blood;" for innocent blood would be shed (Deut. xix. 10).

smiteth a man, so that he dieth, shall be surely put to death. 13. And if a man doth not pursue insidiously,

But, on the other hand, impunity of such fatal heedlessness would have been highly impolitic; the personal safety of the citizens required measures for deterring even from carelessness. And here Moses devised an efficient expedient, admirably in harmony with the circumstances, and the notions of his people. Almost throughout the whole of antiquity, as still at present in the East, it devolved on the nearest relative of a murdered person, as a holy duty, to revenge his kinsman by the blood of his murderer, and he was, therefore, called the "avenger or *redeemer* of blood" (גאל, or גאל דם; Septuagint, ἀγχιστεύων, or ἀ. τὸ αἷμα; compare 2 Sam. xiv.); he who neglected it was considered infamous. The Goel was, in fact, considered the legal heir of the rights and duties of his relative; he had to redeem the property sold by the latter from poverty (Levit. xxv. 24, *et seq.*); he had to ransom his person, if he had fallen into slavery (vers. 48, 49); to marry his widow, if he died without children; and he had the right to receive the property stolen from his relative, and returned by the penitent thief after his death (Numb. v. 8). Now, such custom of avenge of blood, may have been necessary for the protection of life in the infancy of unorganized states, when the governments were too weak to prosecute the perpetrators, or to inspire that fear of retaliation which alone deters the wicked. But such custom is, in fact, barbarous in its origin, and detestable and sanguinary in its effects. It has exterminated entire families and tribes; it often destroys the innocent, whom the Goel, in the heat of his rage, is not always able to distinguish from the guilty; and it tempts to the most insidious, most abject, and most immoral plans of persecution, of which the Arabic writers furnish us more than one revolting instance. Fain would Moses have abolished this whole system of avenge of blood, which became perfectly unnecessary as soon as a well-regulated state, with a powerful executive, was established, and the offender was sure to be visited with the deserved punishment. But prejudices, and deeply-rooted traditional customs, cannot be eradicated by an abstract law. Such an attempt would be the work of an enthusiast, not of a judicious and sober judge of human nature. Moses did not try to *abolish* that custom, but to make it *innoxious*. He did not wish to exempt the *real* and *intentional* murderer from the just resentment of the surviving relative; he was permitted to kill him wherever he found him; and every magistrate was bound to assist him in his pursuit: but he wished at least to protect the merely *suspected*, and yet perhaps innocent, the *unintentional*, and perhaps quite virtuous, manslayer, from the indiscriminate rage of the excited relative. Therefore he ordered the appointment of six *cities of refuge* (ערי מקלט), where such unfortunate persons might find an asylum. In order to facilitate his flight, it was enjoined on the authorities, as a duty, always to keep the roads leading to those towns in perfect repair, to which the traditional exegesis adds many other similarly humane precepts (*Maccoth* ii. 5). As the Goel might yet, in spite of these precautions, kill him on his way to one of the cities of refuge, it was of the highest importance that they were, as much as possible, equally distributed throughout the land, and that their distance from each other was not too great. And these considerations were scrupulously attended to. Moses himself had ordered that three such cities be appointed immediately after their settlement in Canaan, and if the territory of the Israelites should extend, to set apart three more (Deut. xix. 2, 8, 9); and Joshua executed this command after the partial conquest of the land (Josh. xx. 7, 8). On both sides of the Jordan these cities were almost equally remote from each other, so that the greatest distance

וְשַׂמְתִּי לְךָ מָקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יָנוּס שָׁמָּה׃ ס 14 וְכִי־
יָזִד אִישׁ עַל־רֵעֵהוּ לְהָרְגוֹ בְעָרְמָה מֵעִם מִזְבְּחִי תִּקָּחֶנּוּ

of one asylum to the next amounted to about twelve German miles, and the persecuted manslayer could thus, at the utmost, not be more than six miles from a city of refuge. For the towns in the east of the Jordan were: Golan, in Bashan (32° 52′ N.L.), Ramoth, in Gilead (32° 25′), and Bezer (31° 38′); those in the west: Kadesh, in Galilee (33° 6′), Shechem (32° 18′), and Hebron (31° 25′).

But such asylums were intended to harbour really *innocent* persons only, and to withdraw them from the revenge of the Goel; as, for instance, if a person cuts sticks in a forest, and the iron of the axe glides out from the handle, and accidentally kills a man who happens to be near (Deut. xix. 5). Therefore Moses ordered, further, that every fugitive should, at the gates of the city of refuge, be received by the elders or judges, who should hear and conscientiously consider his case; and, if they found him innocent, to assign him an abode in the city; but, if they believed him to be an intentional murderer, to deliver him up to the Goel for punishment (Deut. xix. 11—13; Josh. xx. 45). In difficult cases, he was sent back to the town where the deed was committed, and where the charge against him could best be investigated; and, if he was found guiltless, he was to be safely returned to the same city of refuge (Num. xxxv. 25). Both Moses and Joshua selected, as asylums, Levitical or priestly cities, obviously not only on account of their analogy with the Holy city, but also because the priests and Levites were the most intelligent portion of the nation, and the most thoroughly versed in the injunctions of the law; they were, therefore, best enabled to discern between appearance and truth. Thus, in this salutary institution of the cities of refuge, the possible abuse was obviated, that they protected actual criminals; for this would have been a pollution of the land, a compassion which would have endangered the safety of the state (Deut. xix. 11—13). And we see the circumspect wisdom of the legislator, in one instance, make harmless an old dangerous institution, and in another, surround a new salutary one with beneficial limits.

In his asylum, the fugitive remained till the death of the High-priest; for his exile could as little be abridged, as his flight remitted, by redemption-money (Num. xxxv. 32). In a theocratical state, such an event is of the greatest moment; the High-priest was the representative of the people; and, with a new head of the state, new legal relations took place; it was the only natural epoch in the regular political existence, in which an unintentional murderer might be restored to liberty, unless it was intended to punish him for his offence during his whole life. And this would have been an unnecessary, perhaps an unjustifiable, severity. The unfortunate man, whom a divine decree made an innocent criminal, was sufficiently punished, if he forfeited his liberty for an indefinite period; if he was obliged to leave his property in strange hands, and to live in a foreign town and in a society unknown to him. But some severe punishment was necessary, if such ominous heedlessness was effectually to be prevented. And thus this measure of the legislator also stands in the just and wise medium. If the Goel killed the persecuted after the demise of the High-priest, he was punished with death (*Maimon.* Hilch. Rozeach VII. 13); but if the manslayer left the city of refuge, and was found and killed by the Goel, the latter had no guilt of blood (Num. xxxv. 26, 27). According to some antiquaries, the death of the High-priest was, perhaps, chosen as the epoch of release, because it was believed, that, by the first great expiatory sacrifice which the new High-priest offered (Exod. xxix.), such guilt was atoned for; and Maimonides (Moreh. iii. 40) believes that the national grief at the death of the

but God lets *him* fall into his hand; then I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee. 14. But if a man cometh [1]cunningly upon his neighbour, to slay him

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Presumptuously.

highest clerical officer was calculated to produce a general reconciliation. — In Athens, justifiable homicide was punished with exile of one year (*Potter*, Arch. i. 360).

Exceptional severity was used in the punishment of such men, who, although unintentionally, killed a woman with child, because thus *two* human lives were destroyed, and such a carelessness deserved to be punished as a crime (vers. 22, 23). On the other hand, a mitigation of the law took place, if a master chastised his slave so that the latter expired under the strokes (ver. 20). The master was certainly punished (נקם ינקם), but probably only with money. And this will be found less objectionable, if it is considered: 1. That certainly the master has never the *intention* to kill his servant, since that would be to his own injury in more than one respect. 2. That the master is often *compelled* to punish refractory servants; and that it would be impossible to keep discipline, with many slaves, if the master were not permitted to use a certain severity, which, in some unhappy cases, might, against the master's will, lead to fatal consequences (see on vers. 20, 21). It is further allowed by Moses to defend oneself against the *nightly* thief; and if the latter was killed in that defence, it was no crime of blood. But if this happened in day-time it was a crime, because the aid of the authorities might have been called in against the attacks of the thief (xxii. 1, 2). It is obvious, from the laws hitherto specified, that, in cases of murder, not the authorities, civic or criminal, but the Goel, took the initiative; that, therefore, the murderer, instead of escaping into one of the cities of refuge, could flee from the country altogether, and thus avoid the punishment. This is confirmed both by the analogy of other legislations, as those of the Greeks and Romans, and by examples from the history of the Israelites, for instance, that of David, Absalom, and Jeroboam.

Cities of refuge were not unknown to Greek antiquity, especially for insolvent debtors, for slaves who fled from the cruelty of their masters, and even for murderers. An especially celebrated city of refuge was Daphne, near Antiochia (2 Macc. iv. 33), and the temple of Diana, at Ephesus, where the right of asylum was, in the course of time, more and more extended.

We need scarcely to observe, how infinitely wiser this discriminate legislation of Moses concerning murder is, than the vague precepts of Mohammed, which equally involve the innocent and the guilty (Koran ii. 173): "O you faithful, in cases of murder, the right of retaliation is prescribed to you: a free man for a free man, a slave for a slave, and a woman for a woman. But if the relative pardons the murderer, the latter may yet be punished by a legal judgment and with equity. This mildness and compassion comes from your Lord. But he who, after this, takes still revenge, may expect severe punishment." But the Koran (iv. 94) has also the following law about unintentional murder: "A faithful must not kill another faithful, except if this happen accidentally. But he who kills a believer undesignedly shall, as an expiation, redeem a believer from captivity, and pay a sum to the family of the murdered, except if they remit it to him. If the killed is of a people which lives in hostility with you, but was himself a believer, the atonement is, to release a faithful from captivity. But, if the people is in friendship with you, a ransom must be paid to the family, and a faithful redeemed from captivity. But he who is unable to pay this, shall fast instead during

לָמוּת׃ ס 15 וּמַכֵּה אָבִיו וְאִמּוֹ

two successive months." And in Sur. xvii. 35: "If a person has been unjustly killed, we have given his heir power to persecute him; but he must not be more cruel than necessary in killing him." According to Chardin, the Persian judges delivered the murderer up to the Goel with the following words: "I hand over to you the murderer, in accordance with our laws; revenge the blood which he has shed, but remember that God is just and merciful." (Compare *Rosenmüller*, Orient. ii. 286—292; *Paxton*, Illustr. ii. 157—162). About the fines at present usual in Egypt in cases of murder see *E. Lane*, An account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians i. p. 144. About "avenge of blood" among the Arabians, see *Kitto*, Pict. Bib. on Num. xxxv. 12.

12. This verse expresses the general principle, which was already pronounced in Gen. ix. 6, שפך דם האדם וכ׳, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed"; but applies, of course, only to premeditated murder, that is, such homicide, which originated in internal enmity, and was executed with *consciousness*, or a *homicidium dolosum*. Although the Mosaic code contains no direct precepts concerning manslaughter committed in the excitement of the moment, in passion, drunkenness, etc., it may be concluded, from analogy, that it was not treated with the severity of a premeditated murder, and shared perhaps the same privileges as the justifiable homicide, which seems, indeed, to be implied in Num. xxxv. 22: if one person kills another "*suddenly* without enmity" (בפתע בלא איבה).—But there is in Hebrew no separate word for manslaughter, which is, like murder, and often like homicide in general, designated with רציחה.—שנאה and איבה, hatred and enmity, are the necessary characteristics of murder. According to an addition in Targum Jonathan, the murderer is to be killed *with the sword* (בסייפא, see *Talm.*, Sanhedr. fol. 76 *b*.); generally he understands the expression: "he shall be put to death," to mean *strangulation* (חנק), a punishment still very prevalent in the East (see, however, *Ch. B. Michaelis*: de judiciis poenisque capitalibus). About *lapidation*, see on vers. 15, 17; and about the different kinds of capital punishment in use among the Hebrews, see *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. ii. p. 11.—About מות יומת, the infinitive *Kal* before the *Hophal*, see note on xix. 13.

13. About unintentional homicide. Further details see *Mishna*, Maccoth i.—iii.; *Philo*, De Profugis Opp. i. p. 456, *et seq.* Any murderer, either intentional or not, is called רוצח (see *supra*; Num. xxxv. 26, 27; Deut. xix. 3, etc.).—צדה kindred with צוד, to chase, *to lie in wait*, in which word always the notion of insidiousness and malice (ערמה) is implied. Compare Num. xxxv. 2, 22; 1 Sam. xxiv. 12.—*But God let him fall into his hand*, that is, if it be done by God's inscrutable design, beyond human foresight or control; for everything, the cause and end of which is unknown, is referred to God as the immediate author, who pursues, in all occurrences, His own sublime schemes. Thus is this conception of the Old Testament far superior to the belief of the classical nations in a blind fate, to which even the Gods must bend.—אנה, to cause anything to happen to any one, or to meet with any one.—According to the Rabbins, Moses already appointed even in the desert such places of refuge for involuntary homicide, perhaps always near the altar (ver. 14) or in the camp of the Levites.—It is customary among the Bedouins of the present time, that the murderer, in order to avoid the revenge of the Goel, leaves the land for some time, during which the relatives try to redeem the murder by a sum of money, a practice which was not unknown to the ancient Greeks. But it is evident, how much this differs from the well-regulated and systematically balanced legislation of Moses on this subject, who did not permit an *intentional* murder to

with guile; thou shalt take him from my altar, that he may die.—15. And he who smiteth his father or his

be redeemed by a degrading ransom, as ignominious for the relatives of the murderer as of the murdered; nor were the rich encouraged, more boldly to risk sanguinary deeds than the poor. Compare, however, *Wachsmuth*, Hellen. Alt. II. i. 268.

14. The ordinary place of refuge open to the persecuted murderer, was the altar of a sanctuary, the horns of which he touched (1 Kings i. 50; ii. 28, *et seq.*). This custom prevailed, to a great extent, among the Greeks and Romans, whose poets and historians frequently allude to it (*Herod.*, ii. 113; *Eurip.*, Hec. 149; *Pausan.*, ii. 5, 6; iii. 5, 6; *Dion Cass.*, xlvii. 19; *Liv.* i. 8, 35, 51; *Tacit.*, Ann. iii. 60. 1, etc.; "Tango aras, mediosque ignes et numina testor," *Virg. Æn.* xii. 201). Among the Arabians also the avenging of blood ceased in holy places. This was customary long before Mohammed's time, in the whole neighbourhood round Mecca, especially in the holy month of assembly.—But the unconditional regard for all who sought refuge at the altar, might lead to serious abuses, and an agreement with unprincipled priests might have given permanent support to many punishable crimes. Therefore Moses ordained, that an intentional murderer—according to the Rabbins even an officiating priest—could be taken from the altar and led to death; and the Old Testament furnishes us a striking instance of the strict adherence to this law in the history of Joab, who having insidiously killed Abner, was on the command of Solomon killed at the very altar, whither he had fled for refuge (1 Kings ii. 28—34). But the unintentional manslayer found protection at the altar, till he could, without danger from the Goel, undertake his flight to the next city of refuge.—About the avenging of blood among the Greeks, see *Wachsmuth*, Hellen. Alt. iii. 241, 284; the Trachonites, *Josephus*, Antiq. XVI. ix. 1; and the Arabians, Persians, Abyssinians, Druses, and Circassians, *Chardin*, vi. 10; *Nieb.*, Trav. ii. 430; *Burckhardt*, Trav. ii. 872. Even among the Germanic and Slavonic nations it was in use. See *Tobien*, Die Blutrache nach altrussischem Rechte.—About זוד or זיד, see on xviii. 11. About suicide, see on the sixth commandment. About cities of refuge (Greek, φυγαδεῖα, φυγαδευτήρια, or πόλεις καταφευγῆς), see *Ries*, De Urbibus Refugii V. T. eorumque fructu; *Osiander*, De Asylis Hebraeorum; and *Helfrecht*, Von den Asylen.

5. Violation of the Respect due to Parents. Vers. 15, 17.

In the next three verses punishment of death is threatened to three crimes, which cause no bloodshed, but are moral offences of a flagrant character; for the fifteenth verse treats of *violence* done to the parents, the sixteenth of manstealing, and the seventeenth of *cursing* the parents. It is, therefore, clear that vers. 15 and 17, necessarily belong together, and we are here spontaneously reminded of the remark of Josephus, quoted by Rosenmüller: "the laws were written down by Moses sporadically, and as they were communicated to him by God" (Antiq. IV. viii. 4). The Sept. places, indeed, ver. 17 before ver. 16.—We have in the notes on the fifth commandment pointed out the fact, that, according to the notions of Mosaism, the parents are considered as the earthly representatives of divine holiness; and that, therefore, the offences against the former are punished with the same rigour as the transgressions against the latter. It is thus natural, that not only the wicked *deed* committed against parents (ver. 15), but also the impious *word* (ver. 17) was punished with death; for violation of filial duties is, from that point of view, commuted into a purely theocratical, that is, a *civil* crime. Therefore, the chastisement of disobedient children was not, as

מ֥וֹת יוּמָֽת׃ ס 16 וְגֹנֵ֨ב אִ֧ישׁ וּמְכָר֛וֹ וְנִמְצָ֥א

fences deserving death. The punishment of lapidation was executed before the gates of the town; the witnesses, who had given evidence before the judges against the disobedient son, threw the first stones; then followed the whole people (Deut. xv. 5—7; compare Sanhedr. vi. 4). For there existed in the Hebrew monarchy no regularly appointed executioners; and as every offence was directed against the state and against the public order, the whole people had an interest in punishing it; the infliction of the penalties of the law lost thus much of its cold-hearted barbarity, and was dignified by a higher political and moral element. The original manner of lapidation was probably a tumultuous throwing of stones by the mob, as appears from passages like Exod. xvii. 4; 2 Kings ii. 31, etc. The Roman law provides in the Twelve Tables: "Si parentes puer verberit ast lege plorassint parentes, puer diveis parentum sacer esto." Compare about the similar punishments among the Persians, Greeks, and other nations, *Thucyd.* v. 60; *Xen.* Hell. I. xxiv. 8; *Curt.* vi. 11; *Polyb.* v. 56.

was the case with the Romans, left to the parents; but the worldly judges enquired into such offences, and, if children were found guilty of a rude misdemeanour (according to the Talmud, Sanhedr. 85 *b*, of a stroke, which caused a wound), or of the utterance of imprecations, they were stoned or strangulated (Deut. xxi. 18—21), just as those, who cursed the name of God were stoned (Lev. xxiv. 10—16). About parricide, Moses enacted as little a law as about child-murder, or as Solon about the former crime, and perhaps from the same reason, because he believed that nobody would commit it. This is related by Cicero (Pro Roscio Amerino, 25), who adds: "Sapienter fecisse dicitur, cum de eo nihil sanxerit, quod antea commissum non erat, ne non tam prohibere quam admonere videretur." Nor did Romulus, according to Plutarch, make any provision against that crime (compare p. 365). However, if really such nefarious deed ever occurred among the Israelites, it was not difficult to decide how to punish it, since even the stroke and the contumacious word, were thought horrid of-

6. About Kidnapping (Plagium). Ver. 16.

"He who stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." The same law is repeated in Deuteronomy xxiv. 7; from which passage it is evident, that it treats of kidnapping a *Hebrew;* as in our verse also Targum Onkelos and Septuagint add. And thus the severity of the the punishment, death, without the possibility of redemption, cannot appear surprising. For all Israelites are considered as free citizens with inalienable and equal rights, of which they can never be entirely divested (see on vers. 1—11). Now it is natural, that he who steals an Israelite will, in the rarest cases, keep him as his slave or sell him to an Israelite, as the injured person could, in the Holy Land, easily find means to inform the authorities of his fate, and thus cause the punishment of his criminal master. The latter, therefore, generally sold the kidnapped individual to foreign merchants into distant lands, either to Egyptians, who commanded the land-commerce to the south, or to Phœnicians, who influenced the trade by sea to the west; and opportunities of selling must have easily offered themselves, as Palestine was situated in the exact centre of the commerce of the East. But by such sale, free Israelites became *permanent* slaves; they forfeited, with their liberty, their chief characteristic as Hebrews, and were thus lost to the Hebrew community, the more so, as the exclusive intercourse with pagans must necessarily defile the purity of their faith, and gradually accustom their thoughts to idolatry. For this reason it was, in the Mosaic law,

mother, shall surely be put to death.—16. And he who stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his

interdicted to sell even thieves into foreign countries, because thereby *souls* are, as it were, extirpated from Israel. Thus he who kidnapped Israelites and sold them to other countries justly deserved death, especially if we consider the most melancholy and bitter lot to which the slaves of heathen nations were generally doomed. The spiritual and physical murder was not too severely punished with death (which was, according to Sanhedr. xi. 1, that of strangulation). And in this sense Philo (De Specialibus Legibus ii. p. 338, ed. Mang.) remarks, pathetically: "The kidnapper also is a thief, but of the most precious treasure on earth. Everybody, therefore, whose mind harbours a love for virtue, must hate the kidnapper intensely and implacably, for he does not blush, for the sake of cursed gain, to impose the yoke of servitude upon beings who, by birth, reason, and nature, are his perfect equals. They sell them, for filthy lucre, to slave-mongers or to others; they make them serve strangers far from their native country, so that they cannot, even in their dreams, hail the land of their ancestors, or enjoy, in the remotest degree, any delightful hope."

No doubt that crime was very extensively committed from early times. Joseph was, by his own brothers, sold to foreign merchants, who again sold him to a foreign master. A very severe measure, to deter from such misdeeds, was, therefore, necessary. Besides, this slave-trade was so lucrative, that a pecuniary fine would have been of no effect, as the unprincipled kidnappers could, in the rare cases of detection, easily bear the mulct from their considerable gains. The energetic rigour of this law is, therefore, perfectly wise, and it stands in favourable contrast to the gradual and fluctuating legislation of the Romans on this subject. In earlier times, the Lex Fabia ordained, that if a person bought a freeman, or libertinus, against his will, or if he persuaded another person's male or female servant to run away from a master, or if he concealed him, he was liable to the penalties of the law. Here, two things are confounded which are clearly distinguished in the Mosaic code. Stealing a free man, and making him serve as a slave, can certainly not be brought into the same category with the far less culpable offence of persuading a slave to escape from his master, or to protect him on his flight. The latter was, with laudable humanity, even commanded by the Mosaic law as a duty, whilst the former, if his motive was because he wished to possess the slave himself, is prohibited in the tenth commandment. "Both kinds of man-stealing," says Michaelis, "are very different; by the one, the master of the slave loses only a property, which is valued by money, and which can be reimbursed; by the other, a free man lost something quite invaluable, his liberty, and himself." Further, the penalty of the Lex Fabia was merely pecuniary, which might, perhaps, have been sufficient in the first times of the republic, when the opportunities for the slave-trade were yet rather limited. Later, the punishment was converted into labour in the mines, or crucifixion for the *humiliores*, and confiscation of half their property for the *honestiores*, an invidious distinction, of which the Mosaic law is perfectly free. By a later Senatus consultum, the Fabian law was renewed with more rigid clauses, in order to encourage the recovery of runaway slaves. Among the Athenians, kidnapping was always capitally punished (*Ἐάν τις φανηρὸς γένηται ἀνδραποδιζόμενος, τούτῳ θάνατον εἶναι τὴν ζημίαν*; *Xenophon*, Mem. I. ii. 62).

ונמצא, must be translated: "*or* if he be found" (as in ver. 15, אביו ואמו, "his father *or* his mother), for, as regards the penalty, there can be little difference whether a person, after having stolen a free Israelite, lets him serve as a slave to another, or uses him himself as such,

בְּיָדוֹ מוֹת יוּמָת׃ ס 17 וּמְקַלֵּל אָבִיו
וְאִמּוֹ מוֹת יוּמָת׃ ס 18 וְכִי־יְרִיבֻן אֲנָשִׁים
וְהִכָּה־אִישׁ אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ בְּאֶבֶן אוֹ בְאֶגְרֹף וְלֹא יָמוּת וְנָפַל לְמִשְׁכָּב׃
19 אִם־יָקוּם וְהִתְהַלֵּךְ בַּחוּץ עַל־מִשְׁעַנְתּוֹ וְנִקָּה הַמַּכֶּה רַק שִׁבְתּוֹ
יִתֵּן וְרַפֹּא יְרַפֵּא׃ ס שני 20 וְכִי־יַכֶּה
אִישׁ אֶת־עַבְדּוֹ אוֹ אֶת־אֲמָתוֹ בַּשֵּׁבֶט וּמֵת תַּחַת יָדוֹ נָקֹם יִנָּקֵם׃

although, as we have observed above, the former was, no doubt, by far the more frequent case. Ancient expositors explain ונמצא, thus: if the stolen Israelite was, before his being sold, found in the hand of the kidnapper; and they add, that both conditions were required to constitute the crime: the stolen person must have been seen in the house of the kidnapper, and then have been sold to another, for then only is the offence perfectly clear; but this distinction neither lies in the words of the text, nor in the spirit of the legislation.

17. See on ver. 15.

7. General personal Injury inflicted upon a Freeman. Vers. 18, 19.

The following laws (to ver. 36), treat mostly of *damages* and *injuries*, not of homicide, and the following verses provide for the case, that a *free man* was injured in no chief member of the body. Namely, if a person beats, in a quarrel, a *free* Israelite, or a stranger, so that the latter are thrown on a sick-bed, but recover again so far as to be able to walk about by the aid of a staff (משענתו), without having lost any of the principal limbs, he who had beaten them is free (ונקה) from severe punishment, but he must pay to the injured persons for the loss of their time and must cause their cure from his own means. If a chief member has been injured, the *jus talionis* takes place (see note on vers. 24, 25; compare Levit. xxiv. 19, 20). If the beaten freeman dies *in consequence of the wounds*, however long time, afterwards, the offender is treated after the general laws about murder, that is, it is enquired whether the wounds were inflicted *designedly* or *accidentally*. Impunity was naturally granted if another cause had co-operated to his death (Philo. ii. 317: *καθ' ἑτέρας αἰτίας*).

The stroke was, according to our text, inflicted with a *stone* (באבן), or the *fist* (באגרוף; so the Septuagint and Vulgate, *πυγμῇ*, pugno, which signification is quite appropriate in the only other passage where that word occurs again, in Isa. lviii. 4). The Chaldee and Syriac interpreters, and others, understand it *staff* or *glebe*, so that גרף would be identical with רגב, and אגרף, with מגרפה, a clod of earth (Joel i. 17). The signification *fist* (from גרף, to snatch, Judges v. 20), which the Rabbins already proposed, has been adopted by nearly all modern lexicographers and interpreters (see also Philo, *loc. cit.* *τῇ χειρί*; *Menahem Ben Saruck*: מכת יד). ונקה, he shall be unpunished, which is the usual signification of נקה (see xx. 7). The Rabbins take the word thus: "then the offender shall be released from the prison in which he was incarcerated till it was ascertained whether the consequences of the stroke would be fatal or not." The delinquent must pay a twofold fine: 1st. the value of the time which the injured person lost (שבתו, originally, his *sitting* still, cessation from labour); and 2nd, the whole expences of healing, or, according to Josephus, "as much as he paid to the physicians," to which the Rabbins add: 3rd, for the pain (הצער): and 4th, the disgrace (הבושת). The Romans also had a similar law (*Dig.* ix. 3): "Quum *liberi* hominis corpus ex eo, quod dejectum effusumve quid erit, læsum

hand, he shall surely be put to death.—17. And he who curseth his father, or his mother, shall surely be put to death.—18. And if men strive together, and one smiteth another with a stone, or with *his* fist, and he dieth not, but is thrown upon his bed: 19. If he rise again, and walk abroad upon his staff, then shall he who smote *him* be quit; but he shall pay *for* the loss of his time, and shall cause him to be thoroughly healed.—20. And if a man smiteth his man-servant or his maid-servant with a rod, and he dieth under his hand, [1]it shall surely be avenged.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—He shall.... be punished.

fuerit, judex computat mercedes medicis præstitas, ceteraque impendia, quæ in curatione facta sunt: præterea operarum quibus caruit aut cariturus est, ob id quod inutilis factus est. Cicatricium autem et deformitatis nulla sit æstimatio, quia liberum corpus nullam recipit æstimationem." Thus the Roman law ordains a compensation for all future losses also which might arise from disabling a member, for instance, if a hand, etc. was maimed, whereas Moses prescribes only an indemnification for the time of the illness. On the other hand, the Roman law dispenses with a compensation for disfigurement (בושת), which the Mosaic code, according to the Rabbins, enforces.

8. Personal Injury inflicted upon a Slave. Vers. 20, 21.

Chastisement of a *servant* could not be forbidden; without that means of enforcing obedience, the keeping of servants would, in fact, have been impossible (see on ver. 12—14). But more than this Moses did not allow. It is a great mistake to suppose, that the Hebrew master had complete and arbitrary rule over his servants, that he had the power of life and death over them. It might be correct, that other nations of antiquity considered their slaves as their perfect property, especially the captives of war, whose lives the victors spared, when they had the power to kill them as their enemies. But quite different is the Mosaic law with regard to the life of a slave. To the Hebrews the principle does *not* apply: "apud omnes (?) peraeque gentes animadvertere possumus, dominis in servos vitae necisque potestatem fuisse" (D. I. vi. 1); they did not acknowledge that unfeeling rule: "Servis ipsis nulla injuria fieri intelligitur" (Inst. iv. 3); nor did they content themselves with the later vague enactment, that it should not be lawful, "ultra modum saevire in servos" (Inst. i. 8). The life of the Hebrew slave was, in reality, shielded and considered sacred like that of a free man; with one almost indispensable modification; namely, if the master chastised his servant with a stick (שבט), or any other light instrument of a similar nature, it was to be supposed, that he intended only to bring him back to obedience and discipline, but not to injure him severely. But if he carried this punishment, however lawful in itself, to such extent that the servant died under his hands, he was himself punished (נקם ינקם); but if he continued to live one or two days more, the master suffered no punishment: "for it is his money" (כי כספו הוא), that is, the death of his servant is, in itself, to him a sufficient loss.—From these principles follows naturally: 1. If a person smote the servant of *another*, the usual laws about such offences came into power; 2. If a master smote his own servant

21 אַךְ אִם־יוֹם אוֹ יוֹמַיִם יַעֲמֹד לֹא יֻקַּם כִּי כַסְפּוֹ הוּא׃ ס 22 וְכִי־

with an instrument, which lets us suppose no mere chastisement, as with a sword, an axe, a stone, or the like, he was treated like a murderer, and enjoyed no privileges as a master: for the use of murderous arms against free men also was considered to involve the intention of murder (Num. xxxv. 16—18); and, 3. If the servant lived some days after the ill-treatment of his master, the latter had to pay no fine to anybody, for he himself was the only person who suffered a damage; he lost in the slave a very valuable property.

But that mitigation of the law about homicide naturally took place only with regard to *foreign* slaves; for the Israelitish servant was in all respects treated like the free man; since he was but a *temporary* hireling, who after six years returned to the original state of independence; and homicide committed against him exposed the master to the usual persecution of the Goel. Besides, a foreign slave only can properly be called "the money, that is, the permanent property, of the master"; for he only was really bought (Lev. xxv. 44—46; compare Gen. xvii. 12, 13), and was, like all other property inherited by the descendants. The Egyptian law punished the murder of a free man and of a slave equally with death (Diod. i. 77). Herewith the Mosaic law essentially coincides; with this difference, that it judiciously distinguishes between misadventure and unfeeling barbarity on the part of a master. In Egypt, besides, even a witness who did not prevent a murder, if it was in his power to do so, was considered guilty of capital punishment.

From all this, it is evident, that an *accidental* death of a *foreign* slave in consequence of *just* chastisement was not punished capitally: for *a*) the phrase נקם ינקם, instead of the usual expression מות יומת, denotes merely punishment in general; *b*) the difference of the punishment between the case, that the servant dies immediately, or one or two days later, could not be so very great; but capital punishment, in the first case, would certainly be quite abnormal, if the master is perfectly free in the second: "because it is his money"; and *c*) the analogy of other eastern nations, especially of the Mohammedans, teaches us that offences against slaves were not so severely punished. Mohammed prescribes death only, "if a free man kills a free man, or a slave a slave" (Sur. ii. 173), but not if a free man killed a slave, which is, however, according to the preceding exposition, so mitigated in the Mosaic right in favour of the servants, that the death must be a consequence of a *just chastisement;* if arbitrariness or malice is the cause of the servant's death, it is considered as a felonious homicide. Therefore, the Talmudical interpretation (Sanhedr. lii. b) that execution by the sword was the punishment for killing a slave, is doubtful; it is rather probable, that in such cases the judge, after having carefully examined the cause, imposed upon the master an adequate fine, which was certainly not less than thirty silver shekels, the average price of a slave (*Talm.*, Bab. Kam. 101 a). The general principle laid down in ver. 12: "he who beats a man so that he dies, shall be put to death," cannot be adduced as a proof that the master, who was the accidental cause of his servant's death, was capitally punished. For that principle applies evidently to felonious homicide only, as the following verse, which treats of justifiable homicide, clearly shows. But it is, in fact, difficult to comprehend the logic of those, who will, internally, admit no difference between mere *culpa* and *dolus;* as if the accidental manslayer is likewise to be considered as a wicked and depraved being, to whom God sends such accidents as a deserved punishment. If this were the case, why does the Mosaic law so anxiously provide for his safety in cities of refuge, and characterize his death as shedding innocent blood? Those critics are obliged to take their models of legislation from Pittakus and—the

21. But if he continue a day or two, [1]it shall not be avenged, for he *is* his money.—22. If men strive, and

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—He shall .... be punished.

Icelanders! Perfectly free from punishment was the master only then, if the chastisement of the slave did not occasion the loss of any principal member, which case is provided for in vers. 26 and 27.

9. Injuring a Member of a Free Man. Ver. 22—25.

The following law treats of corporal injuries in a certain complicated case, and breathes also the character of humane consideration for the weaker party, and of respect for the personal safety of the people. It may not be unfrequent in the East, that women threw themselves between their quarrelling husbands, or other men, in order to compose the strife by their entreaties, and even by their mere appearance, which is the more likely among the Hebrews, if we consider the esteem and liberty which the women enjoyed (see p. 370, 371, and on ver. 22). Now if such a woman was with child, and if one of the men, from heedlessness or design, smote her thus that she aborted, he had, on complaint of her husband, to pay a fine according to the estimation of the judge. But if the woman suffered besides another bodily injury, the legislator ordains: "thou shalt give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe." This precept, which is here applied to an individual case is in Lev. xxiv. 19, 20, thus generalized to a fundamental law: "If a man cause a blemish in his neighbour; as he hath done, so shall it be done to him" (compare Judg. i. 7; 1 Sam. xv. 33). This law, which is known under the name of *jus talionis* (right of retaliation), has been branded as barbarous, and has been more than once adduced as a triumphant proof of the sanguinary character of Mosaism, especially as the New Testament (Matth. v. 38, 39) seems to disapprove of it, and commands: "But I say to you, That you resist not evil: but whosoever will smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also (compare Jer. iii. 27; *Talmud*, Sabb. 88 *b*).

But for the unimpassioned, impartial and historical criticism of our law the following points are to be considered:—

1. Moses has not *introduced* that principle of retaliation, but only *tolerated* it, from the same wise motive and with the same profound knowledge of human nature, which induced him not to interfere with polygamy, avenging of blood, and many other old institutions, which, as we can clearly infer, he would have gladly abrogated, had he not feared to meet, in such attempt, with insuperable resistance. The jus talionis is the first, the most natural, and among all primitive nations the most usual method, of punishing for personal attacks, and of deterring from them for the future; and it is, in fact, based on no other principle than that, from which the avenging of blood has sprung. It was an ancient Egyptian law, that scribes who kept false accounts, made erasures from public documents, forged a signature, or altered any agreement without the consent of the parties, were punished with the loss of both their hands, on the principle, that the offending member should suffer (Diod. i. 78). Therefore, it is not only still generally resorted to in the East, but was applied among those nations of antiquity which we still admire, in many respects, as models of civilization and refinement, the Greeks and Romans: it was even retained by that legislator, with whose name we are accustomed to connect a high notion of humanity and wisdom, Solon; but it was sanctioned by him in a form which throws a brighter and more favourable light on the leniency of the Hebrew legislator. For he ordains:

יִנָּצוּ אֲנָשִׁים וְנָגְפוּ אִשָּׁה הָרָה וְיָצְאוּ יְלָדֶיהָ וְלֹא יִהְיֶה אָסוֹן עָנוֹשׁ
יֵעָנֵשׁ כַּאֲשֶׁר יָשִׁית עָלָיו בַּעַל הָאִשָּׁה וְנָתַן בִּפְלִלִים׃ 23 וְאִם־

"if a person strike out one eye of another, he shall lose both his eyes" (*ἐὰν μὲν ἕνα ὀφθαλμὸν ἔχοντος ἐκκόψῃ τις, ἀντεκκόπτειν τοὺς δύο*; *Diog. Laert.*, Solon i. 57; compare also *Diod. Sic.* xii. 2, about Charondas). Further, the Roman Twelve Tables contain the following law: "si membrum rupsit, ni cum eo paicit, talio esto" (see *Festus*, s. v. talio); and in the Institutiones (iv. 4, 7) we read about the historical development of this law: "The punishment for a disabled member was, according to the law of the Twelve Tables, the retaliation (talio): but for a broken bone, pecuniary fines were fixed, considering the great poverty of the earlier Romans. But later the prætor permitted those, who had suffered an injury, to value it, so that the judge condemned the offender either to that sum, which they had mentioned, or to a smaller fine, as he thought proper. But the penalty fixed by the law of the Twelve Tables, fell into disuse; and that which the prætors proposed was acted upon in the courts of justice. For according to the degree of the dignity and the standing in life, the estimation of the injury becomes greater or smaller." This leads us spontaneously—

2. To another mitigating circumstance in our opinion on the Hebrew jus talionis. Bodily injuries could undoubtedly, by agreement with the sufferer, be redeemed with pecuniary compensation; and a literal retaliation of member against member, did not take place, except in that very rare case, that the offended party was implacably revengeful. For whilst Moses expressly and emphatically interdicted the redemption of a murder by money (Num. xxxv. 31), he enjoins no similar precept with reference to injuries, which are certainly open to an amicable arrangement conformable to old customs. Thus the Twelve Tables also speak of the jus talionis only in the case, "ni cum eo paicit," if both parties come to no agreement; and the passage above quoted from the Institutiones shows, that the literal talio was soon entirely abolished, instead of which, in all cases of personal injury, a pecuniary fine was substituted. And this was indubitably the case in the juridical practice of the Hebrews also; so remarks Josephus (Antiq. IV. viii. 35): "He who maims any one, let him undergo the like himself, and be deprived of the same member of which he has deprived the other, unless he who is maimed will accept of money instead of it; for the law makes the sufferer the judge of the value of what he has suffered, and permits him to estimate it, unless he will be more severe." The Talmud (Bab. Kam. 83 *b*.) distinctly states it as a principle: "for the soul of a murderer you shall not take redemption, but you may even take redemption for such principal members which are not reproduced"; and Maimonides (Hilch. Chobel Umasik i. 3) asserts, after the same authority, that a member was not actually maimed for a member, but that its value to the injured person was estimated and paid by the offender. And thus was this law understood by almost all Jewish interpreters, who supported their opinion by the remotest tradition (with the only exception of the Sadducees and Karaites, Meg. Taan. c. 4); and highly interesting is the discussion of Saadiah with the Karaite Ben Suta, which Ebn Ezra quotes, and which shows at the same time, that even the wording of the holy text admits unforcedly of such interpretation:—"Rabbi Saadiah said: We cannot interpret this verse literally; for if a person strikes the eye of another so that he loses the third part of his sight, how is it possible to inflict upon him exactly a similar wound, without addition or diminution, so that he shall not perhaps lose the entire use of his eye? And this is still more difficult with a burning, or wound, or stripe; for if they were inflicted on a dangerous part, they may cause death; and this is absurd.—But Ben Suta rejoined: Is it not written in

hurt a woman with child, so that her fruit depart *from her*, and yet no mischief follow: he shall surely be punished, according as the woman's husband will lay upon him; and [1]he shall bring *it* before the judges.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—He shall pay as the judges *determine*.

another passage (Lev. xxiv. 20): 'If a man cause a blemish in his neighbour; as he hath done so shall it be given to him' (כן ינתן בו).—Saadiah: We have here ב instead of על; and the sense is: so shall the punishment be imposed upon him (compare Bab. Kam. 84 *a*.).—Ben Suta: But we read plainly: 'As he hath done, so it shall be done to him' (Ib. ver. 19, כאשר עשה יעשה לו).—Saadiah: Behold, Samson had said quite similarly: 'as they have done to me, so will I do to them' (Judg. xv. 11); and yet did Samson not take (or intend to take) their wives and give them to others; *but simply he took revenge upon them* [compare Lev. xxiv. 18: מכה נפש בהמה ישלמנה נפש תחת נפש, "he that killeth a beast shall pay for it; beast for beast"].—Ben Suta: Then, if the offender was poor, what shall be his punishment? [if we substitute a fine?].—Saadiah: If a blind man strikes out the eye of another, what shall be done to him? The poor man might become rich and then pay; but the blind man could, after your literal acceptation of the text, never suffer the deserved punishment. And we must accept it as a rule, that we cannot thoroughly understand the precepts of the Law, unless we adhere to the explanations given by our sages of blessed memory. For as we have received the written Law from our forefathers, so have we received the Oral Law from them; there is no difference between the one and the other in this respect" (compare also *Ebn Ezra* on Lev. xxiv. 19; *Maimon*. Hilch. Chobel Umasik i. 2—6; Moreh iii. 41).

The reader finds in this passage also an allusion to the difficulty, nay impossibility, to exercise the jus talionis with exact justice, since it is very precarious, in spite of the greatest carefulness, to injure the member of another, only just as much as he has himself injured his neighbour. Michaelis also has called attention to this point (Mos. R. v. 240—242), and, besides, to the circumstance that the pain of one who is previously informed, that an eye will be coolly torn out to him, is by far more acute and excruciating, than the sufferings of one who loses it suddenly and unexpectedly; for the former feels the agony a thousand times magnified, in anticipation by his tormented imagination: therefore if equal justice, strictly and severely balanced, was the end of the legislator, the literal application of the jus talionis would be the least appropriate means of securing it. However, it must not be overlooked, that the jus talionis was intended at the same time as a *punishment* for crimes and a *warning* for ill-disposed persons; and that, therefore, the offender justly suffers more pain than he, who had been innocently mutilated. However, thus much is certain, that the redemption by money, or its equivalent, was the usual Hebrew practice in cases of personal injury; and it is still so among the Arabs, of which Burckhardt gives a clear instance, which is also quoted by Kitto: "Bockhyt called Djolan a dog; Djolan returned the insult by a blow upon Bockhyt's arm; and Bockhyt wounds Djolan's shoulder with a knife. The Kadi now reckons thus: Bockhyt owes to Djolan, for the insulting expression, one sheep; for the wounding him in the shoulder, three camels; Djolan owes to Bockhyt, for the blow on his arm, one camel; therefore remain due to Djolan, one sheep and two camels."—Even the Koran (v. 49) permits redemption by alms; and Lane (Modern Egypt i. 145) thus describes the practice at present in use in Egypt: "The fine for a member that is single (as the nose) is the whole

אָסוֹן יִהְיֶה וְנָתַתָּה נֶפֶשׁ תַּחַת נָפֶשׁ׃ 24 עַיִן תַּחַת עַיִן שֵׁן תַּחַת
שֵׁן יָד תַּחַת יָד רֶגֶל תַּחַת רָגֶל׃ 25 כְּוִיָּה תַּחַת כְּוִיָּה פֶּצַע תַּחַת

price of blood, as for homicide; for a member of which there are two, and not more (as a hand) half the price of blood; for one of which there are ten (a finger or toe), a tenth of the price of blood: but the fine of a man for maiming or wounding a woman, is half of that for the same injury to a man [the Mosaic code makes no such difference between the two sexes; if there is one, our text shows rather a consideration for the weaker sex]: and that of a free person for injuring a slave, varies according to the value of the slave." It is further evident, that the blind and indiscriminate retaliation would in no manner be just, of which fact ancient commentators and philosophers already have pointed out several examples; for instance, a one-eyed person has the misfortune to knock out, in a passion, one eye of another, who is in the enjoyment of his two sound eyes, would it be just, in order to exercise the jus talionis, to deprive such a man of the only eye left to him? and would this punishment be commensurate with the offence he has committed? Just as little as if a painter's right hand was cut off, with which he supports himself and his family, because he injured the hand of a singer, who maintains himself by his voice (see *Mishn.*, Makk. i. 1; *Talm.*, Cethub. 32; *Cusari*, iii. 46; *Arist.*, Rhet. i. 7; and *Danz*, Origo Talionis in I. G. *Meuschen*, Nov. Test. ex Talmude Illustratum, p. 488, *et seq.*).—If we compare the right of compensation for corporal injuries after the Hebrew and the Roman law, we do not find in the former the tyrannical distinction which the latter admits between the limbs of a poor and a rich man, of a person of high and low rank; *all* citizens are equal before the law, and the injuries of *all* are valued after the same standard; the only distinction adopted in the Mosaic code is that between free men and servants; and even the latter had no reason to be dissatisfied with the provisions introduced by Moses in those cases, of which our text treats (see on vers. 26, 27).

3. The law of retaliation evidently applies only to *intentional* mutilations, inflicted by lurking deceit, by insidiousness or treachery; this we are justified to infer from the analogy of unintentional homicide, which was only punished with a temporary exile; accidental injuries must, therefore, have been treated much more leniently. The case to which our text alludes forms an exception: if a woman with child was, by the carelessness of quarrelling persons injured; because, as we have already observed in p. 400, a severer punishment was necessary in a case, in which, besides the health of the mother, the thriving, or even the existence of the yet unborn offspring was endangered (see on ver. 23).

These arguments will suffice to convince the reader, that the Mosaic law of retaliation, far from being cruel and ferocious, as it has too often been decried, bears the same character of moderation and regard for human life, which distinguishes the Mosaic law in all its enactments. It remains, therefore, only to refute the objection, that Christ appears in the Sermon on the Mount to reject this law of "eye for eye." With regard to this difficulty, we prefer to quote the words of Michaelis, who remarks (Mos. R. v. p. 60): "Christ does not blame the law of Moses: eye for eye, tooth for tooth; since he does, in that whole passage, not speak of Moses, whom he neither interprets nor refutes, but of a questionable moral preached by the Pharisees in the name of Moses. These confounded, as they have done more than once, *civil right* and *morality;* and if in the doctrines of ethics the question was proposed: How far am I allowed to pursue my revenge? they answered with words, which Moses did by no means address to the *offender*, but to the *sufferer*

23. But if *any* mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life, 24. Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, 25. Burning for burning, wound for

or the *judge*: 'eye for eye, tooth for tooth.' That Christ did not intend to contradict or blame the laws of Moses, but only the Pharisees, is evident, if we compare him with Moses. The Hebrew legislator addresses the magistrate, or the offender, who had inflicted personal injury upon his fellow-man, and speaks thus: 'Thou, criminal, hast deserved to give eye for eye, tooth for tooth; and thou, judge, art bound to condemn him to that punishment.'—But Christ manifestly addresses the *offended* person, and forbids him to be vindictive: 'You have heard, that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. But I say to you, that you resist not evil; but whosoever will smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him thy other also.' How these last words are to be understood, and whether I am, indeed, to hold up my other cheek, if the one has been struck, does not concern me at present, for I cannot explain here the Sermon on the Mount. But as long as the people does not consist of citizens, who are entirely so as the Sermon on the Mount wishes them to be, civil laws, which, as Christ himself says, do not permit several things on account of the hardheartedness of the people, would be extremely unwise."—We will not enter into the irrelevant attacks upon the Pharisees; but the chief point of this deduction is simple, that here *civil*, not purely *ethical* laws (משפטים) are specified; the former are enjoined, in order to deter the bad; they must, therefore, neither be too lenient, nor pre-suppose a state consisting entirely of "regenerated" citizens; and, in fact, our own Christian legislation could not dispense with similar principles; life is punished with life, and intentional injuries are visited with more than equivalent penalties. Not even the most sentimental and romantic legislator has ever had the fancy to pardon all criminals out of Christian love. For, in reality, every simple law in our penal codes is based on the jus talionis, with the limitation, that bodily mutilation is converted into an adequate pecuniary fine, or incarceration; but the same modification has been universally adopted by traditional Judaism. Quite different is the case with the *moral* law, if neither the person nor the property has been attacked, but insults and mortifications were inflicted; in such cases a perfect pardon is a religious duty; and the Mosaic law expressly prescribes: "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart," or "Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge; but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Lev. xix. 18, 19), to which principle we shall recur in due place. That the right of retaliation is just *in principle* and *theory*, is unquestionable; for it is an exact retribution of the offence committed; and the more impartial a legislation is, the more frequently is that principle applied as the leading idea. In Mosaism, it is distinctly pronounced as a general rule (Deut. xix. 19, 20); it is the foundation of the laws concerning murder (Gen. ix. 6), theft, false witness and corporal injury. But we must repeat, that, with the exception of murder, it was never carried out to the letter; prudence and moderation warned to insist upon a right, which, if executed with obstinate severity, would have been converted into a most inexcusable injustice.

22. It appears, that women endeavoured by their interference to reconcile the altercations of men, who had proceeded, or threatened to proceed to violence; a practice which, according to Kalbe (Descript. of the Cape of Good Hope, p. 405) is usual among the Hottentots: "If a woman steps between two contending men, they will give up their dissension for the present, and wait for an opportunity to resume their dispute in the absence of women. They never do the least harm

פֶּצַע חַבּוּרָה תַּחַת חַבּוּרָה׃ ס 26 וְכִי־יַכֶּה אִישׁ
אֶת־עֵין עַבְדּוֹ אוֹ־אֶת־עֵין אֲמָתוֹ וְשִׁחֲתָהּ לַחָפְשִׁי יְשַׁלְּחֶנּוּ תַּחַת
עֵינוֹ׃ 27 וְאִם־שֵׁן עַבְדּוֹ אוֹ־שֵׁן אֲמָתוֹ יַפִּיל לַחָפְשִׁי יְשַׁלְּחֶנּוּ
תַּחַת שִׁנּוֹ׃ פ

to a female, not even in the hottest struggle and fiercest rage."—About ינצו see on ii. 13.—אסון harm, mischief. After אסון the dative לה, to her—the woman—is to be understood.—ענש here in its original signification *to fine*, in later Hebraism to *punish* generally (Prov. xxii. 3, etc.).—פלילים *judges*, from פלל, in Piel, to judge, 1 Sam. ii. 25. This word occurs, besides, in Deut. xxxii. 31, and Job xxxi. 11, and only in plural. Almost all ancient translators and interpreters render it here *judges*. But the Sept. translates: μετὰ ἀξιώματος "according to the estimation," which, however, is not adapted in the two passages mentioned.—The preposition ב is sometimes used in the signification of *before*; for instance, Gen. xxiii. 18. —The concerned parties are ordered to appear before the judge, that he might either confirm the amount of compensation imposed by the husband upon the offender, or reduce it, if he deem it exorbitant.

23. According to the Talmud (Sanhedr. 79), and in harmony with the preceding explanations, he who kills a woman in a quarrel shall only pay the *value* of life, since he did not *intend* homicide.

24. Here some members are enumerated for the sake of illustration; but the same principle, expressed in the text, is equally applicable to all other cases of mutilation. A strict anti-climax from the more important to the less essential members, which some have artificially found in our verse, seems scarcely intended by the sacred author.

25. כויה *a burning*, from כוה = كوى and *καίω* to burn.—פצע *a wound*, from פצע, originally to cleave, to make a fissure; Saadiah: שבירת עצם; Rashi: *navradure*, which is synonymous with *blessure*.—חַבּוּרָה or חֲבֻרָה, *a stripe* or *bruise*, from חבר, in the meaning of: "to be marked with stripes or lines." Saadiah: מכת דם; Rashi: *tache*, stain. According to the Talmud, the offender has in all these cases to pay 1. the damage (נזק); 2. the loss of time (שבת); 3. the expences of the cure (רפוי); 4. the disfigurement (בשת); and 5. the pain (צער). See p. 400.

10. Injuring the Member of a Slave. Vers. 26, 27.

The law about the mutilation of a *slave*, which comprises the servant of non-Israelitish descent also, is conceived in a spirit more favourable to the servant than the master (see *Talm.* Kiddush. 24). The loss of any member, from the most essential and noblest, the eye, down to the least indispensable, the tooth, if that loss is a consequence of brutal treatment on the part of the master, causes the immediate manumission of the slave (see on ver. 1—6. p. 381). It is unnecessary to point out the very important and efficient protection which this law secured to the subordinate persons. If the punishment might result in the loss of the servant, its excess was necessarily checked; for every master naturally refrained from risking so serious a consequence. The Rabbins enumerate twenty-four members, the mutilation of which they say is included in our law (אצבעות הידים והרגלים ושתי אזנים והחוטם וראש הגויה שהוא ניד האמה). This law is, in fact, perfectly analogous to the preceding one concerning bodily injuries inflicted upon a *free* man. Here, in our verses, the *pecuniary* loss is the punishment of the master, for a slave is the property, which he loses by his cruelty (compare ver. 21); and so also is the mutilation of a *freeman* punished with a

wound, stripe for stripe.—26. And if a man smiteth the eye of his man-servant, or the eye of his maid-servant, that it perish; he shall let him go free for his eye's sake. 27. And if he smite out his man-servant's tooth, or his maid-servant's tooth; he shall let him go free for his

fine, except in unusual cases of irreconcilable vindictiveness. And thus the milder interpretation of the jus talionis, as a pecuniary compensation, finds, from this side also, a substantial confirmation. The Rabbins apply this whole law exclusively to non-Israelitish slaves. The Hebrew slave, they say, was to be treated entirely like the free Hebrew citizen, and received, therefore, quite the same indemnifications as the latter (see on ver. 25), but had no claim to immediate release, which he obtained after six years, according to the general law about slaves. However, the master was scarcely bound to pay the injured slave for "the loss of time" (שבת), which entirely belonged to the master; nor was it necessary to command him to cause the cure of the slave (רפוי), as this was his own interest. It is, therefore, all but certain, that our law treats of Hebrew as well as of foreign slaves. Punishments were sometimes indispensable; and against excesses in this respect our law secures to the servant a sufficient guarantee.—It appears that, in later times, the Roman emperors often found it necessary to check the ill-treatment to which the slaves were exposed from the masters. Thus Hadrian banished a matron for five years because she acted cruelly against her maidservants from insignificant reasons, and it was felt that obedience of the servants is more effectually secured by moderation and kindness than by unfeeling severity (Lex Dei, etc. Ed. Blume, pp. 24, 25).

11. Injury caused by a Beast. Vers. 28—32.

a. If the injured person is a free man (vers. 28—31).
b. If he is a slave (ver. 32).

Such injuries even as are caused by beasts, are considered and provided for by the circumspect legislator. As an instance, a goring ox is chosen; but the same law applies, probably, as the old interpreters assert, to all other animals also, and the Samaritan codex has, in ver. 28, the addition: שור או כל בהמה. Now, in order to implant the horror against murder, or any mutilation of the human body, by all possible means, such beasts as, in their wild instinct, caused the loss of a human life, were put to death, and their flesh was interdicted for all uses. For *no* crime whatever against the godlike image should remain unpunished, and every impression of the senses was called to aid, to increase the internal aversion to such nefarious deeds. Legislative acts against, and punishment of, animals, were, besides, not unusual in antiquity. According to Plutarch, Solon ordained, "that a dog, which had bitten, should be handed out to the authorities fettered with shackles four ells long." Demosthenes mentions a decree of Dracon, that not only men and animals, but even lifeless things, with which a man had been killed, should be removed from the land; and Pausanias relates a process against the *axe* of the priest of Zeus Polieus, because the priest himself had quitted the land (see *Rosenmüller*, Orient ii. p. 75). Michaelis (Mos. R. vi. p. 27) remarks even, that so late as in the year 1540, the sword with which a murder had been committed, in Toulouse, was, according to the sentence of the judges, hung up at the gallows, because the criminal could not be discovered. The Salic law of the old Franks, and that of the Anglo-Saxons, contained similar clauses. The anxiety of the Hebrew legislator, to prevent bloodshed by a series of impressive

28 וְכִי־יִגַּח שׁוֹר אֶת־אִישׁ אוֹ אֶת־אִשָּׁה וָמֵת סָקוֹל יִסָּקֵל הַשּׁוֹר
וְלֹא יֵאָכֵל אֶת־בְּשָׂרוֹ וּבַעַל הַשּׁוֹר נָקִי׃ 29 וְאִם שׁוֹר נַגָּח הוּא
מִתְּמֹל שִׁלְשֹׁם וְהוּעַד בִּבְעָלָיו וְלֹא יִשְׁמְרֶנּוּ וְהֵמִית אִישׁ אוֹ אִשָּׁה
הַשּׁוֹר יִסָּקֵל וְגַם־בְּעָלָיו יוּמָת׃ 30 אִם־כֹּפֶר יוּשַׁת עָלָיו וְנָתַן פִּדְיֹן
נַפְשׁוֹ כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר־יוּשַׁת עָלָיו׃ 31 אוֹ־בֵן יִגָּח אוֹ־בַת יִגָּח כַּמִּשְׁפָּט
הַזֶּה יֵעָשֶׂה לּוֹ׃ 32 אִם־עֶבֶד יִגַּח הַשּׁוֹר אוֹ אָמָה כֶּסֶף ׀ שְׁלֹשִׁים

laws, seems, in fact, to have been rewarded by the happiest results, since that crime generally appeared in a surprisingly limited extent among the Hebrews, whilst the legislators of other ancient nations contented themselves with some unsystematic attempts which could not produce the desired effect.

It is natural, that the proprietor of the animal which had caused the mischief, was free from other punishment besides the loss of the beast. The case is, however, different, if the savage nature of the animal was known, and the proprietor had been duly warned; if some misfortune happened under such circumstances, not only the beast was killed, but the master also deserved death, as by his heedlessness human life had been sacrificed. However, as death occasioned by such accident could not be punished as severely as an intentional and deceitful murder, redemption by money is permitted, after a just and liberal valuation. If a slave was thus killed, his master received the indemnification, which was, according to the average price, fixed at thirty shekels (see on ver. 32). Thus we see here also, an exact and just proportion between guilt and punishment.

28. Philo (De Special. Leg. ii. p. 323, Ed. Mang.) explains: "It was not right to offer such animal as a sacrifice, or to eat it, because no man ought to use as his food any part of a beast which has killed a man." The Rabbins go still farther, and prohibit even the remotest enjoyment or profit of the flesh of such animal (it is not only אסור באכילה, but also אסור בהנאה).—את־איש או את־אשה. The case is rare that the sign of the accusative, את, stands before an indefinite noun; compare Prov. xiii. 21; Eze. xliii. 10; see *Gesenius*, Gr. § 115. 1, note; *Ewald*, Gr. § 536. 1. ולא יֵאָכֵל אֶת־בשרו. The use of את, is here, as in many other instances, to be explained by the active *sense* of the sentence: "they shall not eat its flesh;" compare Gen. iv. 18; xvii. 5; Numb. xxxii. 5, etc.

29. The proprietor of a beast which was known as dangerous, was also to be killed, because, as Josephus (Antiq. IV. viii. 35) observes: "he was the cause of the death of the person who was killed by his ox." The Talmud understands the punishment here as death "by the hand of heaven" (בידי שמים).—בעליו יומת. As the construction is in Hebrew often after the *sense* (κατὰ σύνεσιν, see ver. 28), and בְּעָלָיו is the pluralis majestatis, with the meaning of the singular, like אדניו, in ver. 32, the verb יומת stands in the singular.

30. But the capital punishment could be redeemed by money. This is, as Ebn Ezra justly observes, not in opposition with the principle enjoined in Numb. xxxv. 31, not to take redemption, for that law treats of insidious murderers, whilst in our case no murder is committed, but homicide, caused by blamable heedlessness. The price was of course fixed by the judges, as Targum Jonathan adds: סנהדרין דישראל; and Ebn Ezra explains: כפר.—על פי הדיינים, expiation, redemption, λύτρον; and Targum Onkelos translates, simply, ממון, money.

31. בן and בת, are here understood by Targum Onkelos and Jonathan, to

tooth's sake.—28. If an ox goreth a man or a woman, that
they die; then the ox shall surely be stoned, and his flesh
shall not be eaten; but the owner of the ox *shall be* quit.
29. But if the ox were wont to push in time past, and it
hath been testified to his owner, and he hath not kept him
in, so that he killed a man or a woman; the ox shall be
stoned, and his owner also shall be put to death. 30. If
there be laid on him a redemption; then he shall give for
the ransom of his life whatsoever is laid upon him.
31. Whether he hath gored a son, or gored a daughter,
according to this judgment shall it be done to him.
32. If the ox gore a man-servant or a maid-servant; he
shall give to their master thirty shekels of silver, and the

refer to *Israelites*, in opposition to the Canaanitish slaves, of whom, as they believe, the following verse treats. But the Hebrew idiom is more favourable to the acceptation of Rashi and others, that those expressions apply to *younger* persons of both sexes, who, as perhaps many might believe, ought to be better guarded by their parents or relatives, and whose accident might be rather ascribed to *their* carelessness than to any fault on the part of the proprietor of the dangerous animal. בן and בת, stand, therefore, in opposition to איש and אשה, in ver. 29.

32. The free Israelite was usually valued at fifty silver shekels (Levit. xxvii. 3); the slave, according to our passage, at thirty. The normal weight, and, later, the normal coin, was the shekel. Much sagacity and ingenuity have been displayed to discover its weight and its value, and after many unsuccessful attempts, most of the Hebrew antiquaries have returned to the statement of the Rabbins, that a holy shekel (שקל הקדש) is equal in weight to 320 middle barley-grains. There are still some genuine Jewish shekels preserved from the time after the exile, for *before* that period no money was, probably, coined under public authority, although half-shekels, and a fourth part of that coin were known (Exod. xxx. 13; 1 Sam. ix. 8). In the year 173 or 174 of the Seleucidic era, the Syrian government granted to prince Simon the privilege of coining; and he ordered whole, half, and quarter shekels to be struck. The emblems were, a manna- or sacrifice-vessel, and a blooming Aaron's rod or a lily. The inscriptions, in old Hebrew characters, contain the value of the coin, the year, and the name of the prince, שמעון נשיא ישראל. These shekels weigh, according to Barthélemy, between 256 and 271¾ Parisian grains; and, if we allow some addition for the wear and tear, we may put down the weight of the sacred shekel, with Boeckh, at 274 Parisian grains, which is equivalent to the Eginetic didrachmon; and the Septuagint translates, in fact, שקל, with *δίδραχμον*, and this is, in silver, about 2*s*. 7*d* (26 Prussian *Neugroschen*). But it is generally assumed, after the Rabbins, that the ordinary shekel in use in earlier periods, was only half of the weight of the sacred shekel, or of the shekel of "royal weight" (אבן המלך, 2 Sam. xiv. 26; compare *Josephus*, Antiq. III. viii. 2, 10); although the expressions used in the Old Testament seem, literally, to imply little more than a shekel regulated by royal decree, and, as such, available for sacred purposes (see 2 Kings xii. 5, and Gen. xxiii. 16). Michaelis takes the proportion of both shekels, as 3 to 5. Twenty gerahs (גרה, bean) were one shekel; half a shekel

שְׁקָלִים יִתֵּן לַאדֹנָיו וְהַשּׁוֹר יִסָּקֵל׃ ס 33 וְכִי־
יִפְתַּח אִישׁ בּוֹר אוֹ כִּי־יִכְרֶה אִישׁ בֹּר וְלֹא יְכַסֶּנּוּ וְנָפַל־שָׁמָּה שּׁוֹר
אוֹ חֲמוֹר׃ 34 בַּעַל הַבּוֹר יְשַׁלֵּם כֶּסֶף יָשִׁיב לִבְעָלָיו וְהַמֵּת יִהְיֶה־
לּוֹ׃ ס 35 וְכִי־יִגֹּף שׁוֹר־
אִישׁ אֶת־שׁוֹר רֵעֵהוּ וָמֵת וּמָכְרוּ אֶת־הַשּׁוֹר הַחַי וְחָצוּ אֶת־כַּסְפּוֹ
וְגַם אֶת־הַמֵּת יֶחֱצוּן׃ 36 אוֹ נוֹדַע כִּי שׁוֹר נַגָּח הוּא מִתְּמוֹל
שִׁלְשֹׁם וְלֹא יִשְׁמְרֶנּוּ בְּעָלָיו שַׁלֵּם יְשַׁלֵּם שׁוֹר תַּחַת הַשּׁוֹר וְהַמֵּת

was a bekah (בקע); 100 shekels made probably a mina (מנה, *μνᾶ*; compare 1 Kings x. 17, and 2 Chron. ix. 16); and 3,000 made a talent (ככר), which is equivalent to 822,000 Parisian grains, so that a talent of silver is equal to about £400 sterling, and a talent of gold to about £4,000 to £6,000 (Exod. xxxviii. 35, *et seq.*). Therefore, the punishment fixed in our verse would be 72*s.* 6*d.* if we take here the *sacred* shekel to be meant, which sum will not be deemed inadequate if we consider that, in ancient times, money had fifteen or twenty times its present value (according to *Michaelis*, M. R. v. § 243, even fifty times more). Josephus (Antiq. XII. ii. 3) mentions as the price of a slave 120 drachmas, or 97*s.* 6*d.*; it is a matter of course, that, for superior slaves, the price was much higher (Antiq. XII. iv. 9). See, in general, *Reland*, De Nummis Samaritanorum, p. 188; *Böckh*, Metrologische Untersuchungen; *Bertheau*, Zwei Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Israeliten; *De Wette*, Arch. § 184; *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. ii. p. 443—446; *Saalschütz*, M. R. p. 201—210.

THE RIGHT OF PROPERTY, XXI. 33—XXII. 14.

12. If it is Endangered by NEGLECT of Others. Vers. 33, 34.

After the right of *persons* has been treated in all its possible relations, follow the laws about injury done to property, either *indirectly* by carelessness (ver. 33—36), or *directly* by theft or defraudation (ver. 37—xxii. 14).—The first of these laws treats of a case, in which a person is but the very remote occasion of a loss. Namely, if he opens a pit already existing in public places or streets (ברשות הרבים), or digs a new one without covering it, he may become the cause of the death of an animal, which falls into that pit. In this case, he shall pay to the proprietor the value of the animal; but the dead beast belongs to himself. This is undoubtedly a just law, which not only protects those who possess cattle against a frequent source of damage; but which, as Ebn Ezra remarks, is calculated to prevent animals from being sacrificed bootlessly without serving the use and convenience of man.—It is well-known, that the Oriental cisterns are usually covered with a large stone, which is removed, when the flocks of the whole neighbourhood are watered together: for if they were left open, the water which they contain would soon, by the sand which the wind drives into it, be troubled, if not entirely covered (see Gen. xxix. 2, 3). Compare about this law Philo (ii. p. 324, ed. Mang.), and Josephus (Antiq. IV. viii. 37), who says: "Let those who dig a well or a pit, be careful to lay planks over them, and so keep them shut up, not in order to hinder any person from drawing water, but that there may be no danger of falling into them" (*ὡς ἐμπεσουμένοις*). However, about the case, that a human being falls into such open pit, the legislator has made no provision; for a man may, by some precaution, avoid the danger. That cases of such kind really

ox shall be stoned.—33. And if a man openeth a pit, or if a man diggeth a pit, and doth not cover it, and an ox or an ass fall therein; 34. The owner of the pit shall pay *for it, and* give money to their owner, and the dead *beast* shall be his.—35. And if one man's ox hurteth another's, that he die; then shall they sell the live ox, and divide the money of it; and the dead *ox* also they shall divide. 36. Or if it be known that the ox was wont to push in time past, and his owner hath not kept him in; he shall surely pay

occurred is evident from several passages (Ps. vii. 16; cxix. 85, etc.). But he ordains that he, who omits to make a battlement around the roof of his house, must accuse himself of guilt of blood, if a misfortune happens; and this offers an analogy, from which we may infer, that if a person fell into an uncovered pit, the author of the accident was deemed guilty, although the Rabbinical right declares him innocent (*Mishn.*, Bab. Kam. v. 6). But some severity was certainly necessary, if we consider, that many human lives might be risked by such carelessness.—Compare Bab. Kama, 50, *b.* (where the depth of the pit is required to be not less than ten hand-breadths, טפחים).—בעל הבור designates him, by whose heedlessness the pit had become the cause of the misfortune.

13. If one Man's Animal is Injured by that of Another. Vers. 35, 36.

From the loss, which a *person* causes to the property of another, the legislator passes to the damage, which is done by one animal to another. If, for instance, an ox kills the ox of another, the former is sold, and the money divided between both proprietors, as is also done with the killed ox. For here is no guilt on either part, but merely an accident. However, Rashi observes justly, that this law could be applied in the case only, if both oxen were of nearly the same value; for else it might happen, that the master of the goring animal gained a considerable advantage by the division of the much more valuable ox which was killed; and thus it would encourage rather than check the carelessness.—But if it was known to the master that the ox was goring, and if he had been warned (see ver. 29, which words the Sept. here add again), he was bound to pay the full value of the dead ox, which, besides, belonged to the *injured* party. This is the Talmudical interpretation of the words: והמת יהיה־לו. The pronoun לו is ambiguous; but from the severity of the punishment in ver. 29, with reference to an ox known to be goring, we may conclude, that the master must bear a greater loss than merely the payment of the price of the killed ox, for which indemnification the latter would belong to him.

14. Laws about Theft. Ver. 37—XXII. 3.

We shall in these ordinances also discover the same legislative wisdom, with which, in all instances, the proportion between offence and punishment has been balanced, and with which everywhere the existing circumstances have been judiciously regarded. The purely moral prohibition is contained in the eighth and tenth commandments, and is repeatedly enjoined (Lev. xix. 11), these verses specify the penal laws. Now it is known, that there are especially two motives inducing to theft: 1. avarice, and 2. in cases of poverty, indolence and aversion to work (see *Mich.* Mos. R. vi. § 282); for the former case there is no more appropriate punishment than enhanced restitution of the stolen goods;

יִהְיֶה־לּוֹ׃ ס 37 כִּי יִגְנֹב־אִישׁ
שׁוֹר אוֹ־שֶׂה וּטְבָחוֹ אוֹ מְכָרוֹ חֲמִשָּׁה בָקָר יְשַׁלֵּם תַּחַת הַשּׁוֹר
וְאַרְבַּע־צֹאן תַּחַת הַשֶּׂה׃

and for the latter, none is more efficient than forced and hard labour. And these are, indeed, the two kinds of punishment, which Moses introduced for theft. He seems, besides, to have started from the point of view, that the thief, who possesses property, commits the offence from avarice, whilst he, who is destitute of the means of supporting himself, commits it from antipathy to honest activity. From this principle the two chief laws of Moses with regard to theft are self-evident; namely: 1. The thief shall restore the theft doubly, if it is still found untouched in his hands (xxii. 3); and 2. If he is unable to pay the fine, he shall be sold into servitude to a Hebrew master, and serve him till he can pay the fine (ver. 2). By these arrangements the avaricious will be effectually induced to contentment with his own lawful property, whilst the lazy will be prompted to legitimate and spontaneous activity. But the Mosaic code establishes further the following appropriate gradation: 3. If the thief has, before his detection, applied the theft to his own uses; for instance, if he has killed stolen cattle, a still more increased fine is imposed upon him, because he has manifestly proved, that he did not, impelled perhaps by his better conscience, intend voluntarily to return the theft; and therefore he is obliged to pay, instead of one ox, five, and instead of one lamb, four. As the ox is of such paramount importance to an agricultural people, who use horses but seldom for that purpose, it was necessary to protect the proprietors the more efficiently against such thefts, which might cause the entire ruin of their households, and therefore the stealing of a lamb was only fined with the fourfold value, since the proprietor simply loses the animal, but not any working-power. Too indistinct, and without a well-defined principle, is the provision of the Roman law: "Sed et qui porcum, vel capram, vel berbicem abducunt, non tam graviter, ut hi qui majora animalia abigunt, plecti debent." 4. If the thief breaks into the house at night, it is lawful to resist him, if necessary, with force; and if the master of the house unfortunately kills him in the encounter, he is free from guilt of blood, since the lawless delinquent executed his criminal design at a time, when it was impossible to call in the aid of the authorities against his violence. This reason the master can no longer plead, if the house-breaking is committed by day (אם זרחה השמש עליו); in this case that resistance which causes the death of the thief, is guilt of blood, for the proprietor might have been able to obtain assistance from the officers of justice. Besides, it cannot be discerned in the night, whether the offender intends only to commit theft, and not murder also, and therefore it was necessary, to permit self-defence even on the risk of a deadly conflict (see on xxii. 2). The Koran (v. 42) prescribes about the same offence: "Cut off the hands of a thief, to punish

כב 1 אִם־בַּמַּחְתֶּרֶת יִמָּצֵא הַגַּנָּב וְהֻכָּה וָמֵת אֵין לוֹ דָּמִים׃

CHAPTER XXII.

1. מחתרת, irruption, from חתר (irrupit in domos); Job. xxiv. 16; Septuagint, διορύγματι; Vulgate, "perfodiens;" less appropriate is the interpretation of others, as *instrumentum perfossorium*. "We must consider," remarks Rosenmüller, "the facility of breaking through walls in the Orient, for the houses seem in

ox for ox; and the dead shall be his own.—37. If a man stealeth an ox, or a sheep, and killeth it, or selleth it; he shall restore five oxen for an ox, and four sheep for a sheep.

him for the crime he has committed. This warning punishment is from God; for He is omnipotent and all-wise."—The Solonic law, quoted by Demosthenes, ordains: "If a thief steal in the night, it is lawful to persecute, and thus to kill or to wound him" (*εἰ δέ τις νύκτωρ ὁτιοῦν κλέπτοι, τοῦτον ἐξεῖναι καὶ ἀποκτεῖναι καὶ τρῶσαι διώκοντα*). The Roman law of the Twelve Tables permits also to kill a nightly thief, "if this is only testified by loud cries" (ut tantum id ipsum cum clamore testificetur); and analogous provisions contains the old German legislation (see *Henke*, Geschichte des Deutschen Peinlichen Rechts, p. 99).—The English law defines burglary similarly to the Hebrew code: "To constitute the crime the act must be committed in the night, or when there is not daylight enough to discern a man's face."—About kidnapping see on xxi. 16.—About defraudation of entrusted or found property, see on xxiii. 4.

37. Our text treats of theft of cattle, not only on account of its frequency among nomadic and agricultural tribes, but also on account of its most ruinous character; and, therefore, almost all ancient legislations contain very careful and detailed clauses against that crime (compare *Walter*, Hist. of Rom. Right, p. 807); nor have modern codes of law overlooked this subject. Justinius (ii. 8) observes, with respect to the Scythians: "No crime is considered more punishable among them than theft; for as they have their herds and flocks in their forests without any guard or protection, what would be safe if it were allowed to steal"? The fourfold restoration of stolen sheep is also mentioned in 2 Sam. xii. 6; but the exclamation (Ibid. ver. 5): "The man who committed the crime is a man of death"! does not permit us to suppose, that the king had in certain cases the right, to enhance the punishment for theft according to his individual will. That expression is merely an outburst of indignation against the moral corruption of the offender, which, however, cannot influence the strict and literal enforcement of the penal laws. Nor are we justified to conclude with Michaelis, from Prov. vi. 30, 31, that in Solomon's time a sevenfold instead of a fivefold restoration for cattle was introduced. The expression "seven times" is often used in the Bible indefinitely as a round number (see note on xxiii. 10, 12). Although our law speaks only of animals, it cannot be doubted, that the same provisions are equally applicable to all other moveables. Josephus (Antiq. IV. viii. 27), says with regard to a theft, which is found complete in the hands of the thief (xxii. 3): "he that has purloined *gold* and *silver*, let him pay double." Hence follows, that if the property was already sold, or in any other way applied by the thief, a fourfold or fivefold restoration was his punishment. But the fines for stolen *cattle* were, perhaps, generally more rigorous from the reasons above alluded to.

CHAP. XXII. 1. If [1]the thief be found breaking in, and be smitten that he die, [2]*there is* no *guilt of* blood upon

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—A thief. [2] *There shall* no blood *be shed* for him.

ancient times, as is the case at present, to have consisted of clay laid between transverse beams. Compare Job iv. 19. Of the houses of the Persians this is fully confirmed by Chardin (Voy. iv. p. 110, Ed. Langles.)." אין לו דמים, he, who

2 אִם־זָרְחָה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ עָלָיו דָּמִים לוֹ שַׁלֵּם יְשַׁלֵּם אִם־אֵין לוֹ וְנִמְכַּר
בִּגְנֵבָתוֹ׃ 3 אִם־הִמָּצֵא תִמָּצֵא בְיָדוֹ הַגְּנֵבָה מִשּׁוֹר עַד־חֲמוֹר עַד־
שֶׂה חַיִּים שְׁנַיִם יְשַׁלֵּם׃ ס שלישי 4 כִּי
יַבְעֶר־אִישׁ שָׂדֶה אוֹ־כֶרֶם וְשִׁלַּח אֶת־בְּעִירֹה וּבִעֵר בִּשְׂדֵה אַחֵר

ס בעירו קרי

has killed the thief, is not considered guilty of murder; he bears, *morally*, no guilt of blood; much less is it admissible to avenge the blood of the thief. About this signification of דם, as "moral guilt of blood," compare Deut. xix. 10.

2. Jewish tradition understands the words: "If the sun shone upon him" (אם זרחה השמש עליו), to mean: If it is clear to you like the sun; namely, that the thief intended only to steal, not to murder also (Sanh. 72 *a*; Targum Jonathan). But nearer to the sense translates Onkelos: "if eyes of witnesses (דסהדיא, not דסהריא) fall upon it," that is, if the house-breaking was attempted by day; or, as Rashi explains, in the absence of the master of the house, whilst strangers happened to see and seize the offender. Compare Gen. xxxii. 32; Judges ix. 33; 2 Sam. xxiii. 4. About the reason of the difference between diurnal and nocturnal theft, see *supra*.—*He shall make full restitution*, namely, five oxen instead of one, and four sheep instead of one sheep.—*Then he shall be sold for his theft*. The Rabbins, urging the word בגנבתו, interpret, that he shall only be sold for the *theft*, not for its multiplied restitution, and that the value of the theft must amount to more than the price of the slave. However this may be, he could only be sold for a period not exceeding six years, and only to a *Hebrew* master; and Josephus (Antiq. XVI. i. 1) writes thus on a contrary measure of Herod: "He enacted a law, no way like our original laws, and which he enacted himself, to expose housebreakers to be ejected out of his kingdom, which punishment was not only grievous to be borne by the offenders, but contained in it a dissolution of the customs of our forefathers; for this slavery to foreigners and such as did not live after the manner of Jews . . . . was an offence against our religious settlement, rather than a punishment of the offenders . . . . This law seemed to be a piece of insolence of Herod, when he did not act as a king but as a tyrant." After six years, the Israelitish servant must be released, which could not be guaranteed if he was sold to a foreign master (see also *Philo*, Opp. ii. 336).

3. Ebn Ezra remarks: "This verse comprises all kinds of cattle; and tradition understood the law of fourfold and fivefold restitution to refer to a stolen lamb or ox only." However, the difference between this verse and xxi. 37, is, rather, that here the theft is supposed still to be in the hands of the thief, but there already sold to others. The *double* restitution was also legally enacted in all other cases of stolen property; see *supra*, and *Josephus*, Antiq. IV. viii. 27. Besides, the Talmud observes (Bab. Kam. 62): כל דבר בכלל תשלומי כפל בין שיש בו רוח חיים בין שאין בו רוח חיים.

Increased restitution was the punishment of theft in the old Greek legislation, and according to the Roman Twelve Tables (see *Adam*, Röm. Alt. i. 426; and *Gell.* xi. 18), and is still customary among the Arabs (*Wellsted*, Travels, i. 287). But in general the Roman law offers the following points of comparison: The punishment for *furtum manifestum*, by the law of the Twelve Tables was *capitalis*; a freeman who had committed theft was flogged and consigned to the injured person. Later, the penalty was changed into an *actio quadrupli*, both in the case of a slave and a freedman. Here we see only that difference from the Mosaic law, that the latter did not vacillate, nor ex-

him. 2. If the sun shone upon him, *there is guilt* of blood upon him; he shall make full restitution; if he have nothing, then he shall be sold for his theft. 3. If the theft be certainly found in his hand alive, whether it be ox, or ass, or sheep; he shall restore double.—4. If a man causeth a field or vineyard to be depastured, and driveth in his beast, [1]so that it feedeth in another man's field; the best of his field, and the best of his vineyard, shall he

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—And shall feed.

perimentally fix the unreasonable and disproportionate penalty of death for the offence of theft, but at once, with safe and sound firmness, introduced increased restitution. If the theft was *nec manifestum*, that is, if the thief was not caught whilst he was engaged in carrying the stolen thing away to another place, the penalty was twofold restitution. The similar mitigation of the Mosaic code (ver. 3), is certainly more rational, since it is all but indifferent whether the theft is found in the hands of the thief on his way home, or in the house itself. A nightly thief might be killed if caught in the act, and he might also be killed in the daytime if he was caught in the act and defended himself with any kind of weapon. The first case coincides perfectly with the words of the Mosaic law (ver. 1), whilst the second is at least not against its spirit, as, in all cases when it could fairly be supposed that murder and plunder were equally intended, self-defence, without regard to the consequences, was permitted. But an invidious distinction is again made in the Roman law with regard to the penalty of slaves: they were whipped and thrown down a precipice, a law which is utterly at variance with the genius of Mosaism. The Roman law makes, further, a difference between *abactores* and *fures*: "Abigei proprie hi habentur, qui pecora ex pastu et ex armentis subtrahunt, et quodammodo deprædantur, et abigendi studium quasi artem exercent, equas de grege, vel boves de armentis abducentes. Ceterum si quis bovem aberrantem, vel equum, in solitudinem abduxerit, non est abigens, sed fur potius" (Lex Dei, Ed. Blume, p. 90). The same distinction is made by Moses in a similar case (vers. 9, 11: נשבה and נגנב); but the penalties are fixed with equity and clearness (see note there).

15. About depasturing foreign Fields or Vineyards. Ver. 4.

If a person lets his cattle graze on the field of another, he must restore the damage from the best part of his own fields. Although the legislator (Deut. xxiii. 24, 25) permits the wanderer to eat grapes of a vineyard, and ears of a corn-field after his heart's desire, with that limitation only, in the first case, not to gather grapes in a vessel, in the other not to cut the ears with a sickle, because thus evidently more would be taken from the property of others than is necessary for the momentary satisfaction of his hunger or the gratification of his appetite; yet, pasturing cattle on foreign fields is too obvious and too injurious an encroachment upon the property of others, especially among a people the whole legislation of which aimed at the promotion of agriculture, to encourage or to permit it in the remotest manner, and it was, therefore, necessary to deter the proprietors of cattle from such infringements by an adequate penalty. The Samaritan codex, and the Septuagint, which here literally follows the former, express that punishment thus: "he shall pay from his field according to its produce; and if his cattle has depastured all the field of another, he shall pay the best of his field,

מֵיטַב שָׂדֵהוּ וּמֵיטַב כַּרְמוֹ יְשַׁלֵּם׃ ס 5 כִּי־תֵצֵא
אֵשׁ וּמָצְאָה קֹצִים וְנֶאֱכַל גָּדִישׁ אוֹ הַקָּמָה אוֹ הַשָּׂדֶה שַׁלֵּם
יְשַׁלֵּם הַמַּבְעִר אֶת־הַבְּעֵרָה׃ ס 6 כִּי־יִתֵּן
אִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ כֶּסֶף אוֹ־כֵלִים לִשְׁמֹר וְגֻנַּב מִבֵּית הָאִישׁ אִם־יִמָּצֵא
הַגַּנָּב יְשַׁלֵּם שְׁנָיִם׃ 7 אִם־לֹא יִמָּצֵא הַגַּנָּב וְנִקְרַב בַּעַל־הַבַּיִת

and the best of his vineyard;" and the Vulgate renders the last words of our text thus: "quicquid optimum habebit in agro vel vinea pro damni æstimatione restituet." It is self-understood, that the compensation was always proportionate to the damage (compare *Talmud*, Bab. Kam. 6).

It seems further obvious, that the pronouns in שדהו and כרמו refer to the master of the cattle (see Vulgate, *supra*), although some of the Rabbins apply them to the master of the field. בער, originally, to consume, to devour; בְּעֵרָה, conflagration, thence in Piel and Hiphil, to depasture (בְּעִיר, cattle, beasts, a collective noun). The second part of the verse, from ושלח, is the explanation and illustration of the preceding words: if a man *drives* his cattle himself to the field or the vineyard of another, then he forfeits the penalty of the law; from which seems to follow, that if the cattle goes on a foreign field accidentally, and without their proprietor being aware of it, the latter is guiltless (the Rabbins explain, Bab. Kam. 53: שלוח הוא נזקי מדרך כף רגל ובער הוא נזקי השן האוכלת ומבערת). בְּעִירוֹ=בְּעִירֹה (which is in the Keri), see ver. 26, כְּסוּתֹה; compare xxvi. 10; Jer. ii. 21; Eze. xx. 40. מיטב, the best, choicest; Michaelis (Mos. R. iii. § 161) connects this word with the Arabic موطوب, multum frequentatur pascendo locus; and translates it: *pasture*, which is entirely against the Hebrew use of the word (see 1 Sam. xv. 9, 15), and against the authority of all ancient translators.

16. About Damages caused by Fire on Fields. Ver. 5.

It is customary in the East, before the beginning of the rainy season in July and August, to set fire to the herbage which was left on the fields, and especially to the thorns and weeds; by which process the fertility of the soil for the following year is materially enhanced. But as in that time the fields are extremely dry and parched by the exceeding and continuous heat of the past summer months, it requires the utmost circumspection and care to keep the flame in due bounds, which, if the direction of the wind and the quality of the soil are not attentively studied and regarded, would spread in devastating fury, and irresistibly carry desolation to all surrounding fields. Travellers relate fearful instances of such calamities; and it was therefore the imperious duty of the legislator to prevent such catastrophes by an energetic law, and to punish even carelessness with the same rigour as malignity; and in consideration of the great importance of this subject, the Talmud has given very minute precepts how to deal with fire on fields (see *Talm.*, Bab. Kam. 59 *b*, etc.). The same practice obtained among the Italian farmers, as Virgil mentions (Georg. i. 84, 85):

> "Sæpe etiam steriles incendere profuit agros
> Atque levem stipulam crepitantibus urere flammis."

קוץ thorn or thistle.—The fire can consume either גָּדִישׁ "a heap of sheaves" (from גָּדַשׁ to heap up; compare Arabic جدیس; Sept. ἅλωνας, threshing-floor; because the sheaves were brought there to be threshed); or קָמָה the standing

restore.—5. If fire breaketh out, and catcheth thorns, so that the sheaves of corn, or the standing corn, or the field be consumed thereby, he [1]who caused the conflagration shall surely make restitution.—6. If a man delivereth to his neighbour money or vessels to keep, and it is stolen out of the man's house; if the thief be found, let him pay double. 7. If the thief be not found, then the master of the house shall be brought to the judges, [2]*to swear that* he

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Kindled the fire.

[2] To see whether he have not, etc.

haulms (from קום, Vulg. stantes segetes); or שָׂדֶה, any other produce of the field, trees or vegetables (Rashi: שליחכה את נידו וצריך לניר אותה פעם שנייה; Biur: שהוציאה צמחה ולא נתבשל עדיין; Vulg. indistinctly: in agris).—In all these cases the originator of the conflagration must pay the loss of his neighbours: "although he has lit the fire in his own field, and the flames spread by themselves through the thorns, which they found in their way, he must yet pay, because he did not guard the fire, and prevent it from spreading and causing damage" (*Rashi*).

17. About Property committed for safe-keeping. Vers. 6—12.

In the following verses, the laws concerning the safe-keeping of the property of another are specified; and in this respect the distinction is established and adhered to, that if inanimate objects were, by cunning or violence, wrested from the depositary, he was not bound to make restitution to the proprietor; but, if animals, as oxen, asses, or sheep, were intrusted to his care, he was responsible for theft (ver. 11), but not for such accidents as the death of an animal, or its abduction by robbers or laceration by a wild beast. But if it is found that he had in any way intended to act fraudulently to the proprietor, he was compelled to restore to him the two-fold value of the deposit. All these disputes were decided by the competent judge, by means of adjuration. This is the clear connection of our verses; and the laws which they contain bear likewise the character of prudence and justice. But the traditional Jewish exegesis finds, besides, in these clauses, the distinction, that vers. 6—8 treat of a gratuitous guardian (שומר חנם), whilst vers. 9—12 speak of a paid depositary (שומר שכיר). For the inanimate objects mentioned in vers. 6—8 require no particular attention on the part of the trustee, who can, therefore, not well claim remuneration, whilst the guarding of animals is inseparable from trouble and anxieties, and, therefore, deserves some compensation. Nor was the depositary bound to make restitution in the latter case, if animals under his care were violently seized by wild beasts, or abducted in any other manner, which it was not in his power to repel or subdue. This Rabbinical distinction, although not mentioned in our text, seems to be perfectly logical, and stands in full harmony with the spirit of these laws.

6. If the inanimate property has been stolen from the house of the depositary, the *thief*, if discovered and seized, must pay its twofold value to the proprietor.

7. If the thief is not found out, the trustee (בעל־הבית) must come before the judge (אלהים, see note to xxi. 6) and *swear*, that he has not (אם־לא) embezzled the property (מלאכת, Targ. Jon. עיסקא, thing; Sept. παρακαταθήκη). Before אם־לא we must supply, after the analogy of ver. 10: "and he shall swear," which the Septuagint and Vulgate really add (καὶ ὀμεῖται, et jurabit).—About the use of אם, as the introduction to an oath, see *Ges.*, Lehrg. § 231, 3, 3.—Josephus (Antiq. IV. viii. 38), treating of this law,

אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים אִם־לֹא שָׁלַח יָדוֹ בִּמְלֶאכֶת רֵעֵהוּ׃ 8 עַל־כָּל־דְּבַר־
פֶּשַׁע עַל־שׁוֹר עַל־חֲמוֹר עַל־שֶׂה עַל־שַׂלְמָה עַל־כָּל־אֲבֵדָה אֲשֶׁר
יֹאמַר כִּי־הוּא זֶה עַד הָאֱלֹהִים יָבֹא דְּבַר־שְׁנֵיהֶם אֲשֶׁר יַרְשִׁיעֻן
אֱלֹהִים יְשַׁלֵּם שְׁנַיִם לְרֵעֵהוּ׃ ס 9 כִּי־יִתֵּן
אִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ חֲמוֹר אוֹ־שׁוֹר אוֹ־שֶׂה וְכָל־בְּהֵמָה לִשְׁמֹר וּמֵת אוֹ־
נִשְׁבַּר אוֹ־נִשְׁבָּה אֵין רֹאֶה׃ 10 שְׁבֻעַת יְהוָֹה תִּהְיֶה בֵּין שְׁנֵיהֶם
אִם־לֹא שָׁלַח יָדוֹ בִּמְלֶאכֶת רֵעֵהוּ וְלָקַח בְּעָלָיו וְלֹא יְשַׁלֵּם׃
11 וְאִם־גָּנֹב יִגָּנֵב מֵעִמּוֹ יְשַׁלֵּם לִבְעָלָיו׃ 12 אִם־טָרֹף יִטָּרֵף יְבִאֵהוּ
עֵד הַטְּרֵפָה לֹא יְשַׁלֵּם׃ פ
13 וְכִי־יִשְׁאַל אִישׁ מֵעִם רֵעֵהוּ וְנִשְׁבַּר אוֹ־מֵת בְּעָלָיו אֵין־עִמּוֹ

lets the depositary go ἐπὶ τοὺς ἑπτὰ κριτάς, "before the seven judges," as was customary in his time.

8. *For all manner of trespass*, that is, in all cases when a person has embezzled property committed to his care, but pretends that it has been destroyed or robbed, in spite of his faithful vigilance.—אשר יאמר כי־הוא זה, *of which it is said that it is this*, or, if property has been lost and recovered, and if the proprietor or a trustworthy witness say, that those are the authentic objects, then the dispute shall be brought before the judges. These concise words have been very differently interpreted. The Septuagint translates καὶ πάσης ἀπωλείας τῆς ἐγκαλουμένης· ὅ, τι οὖν ἂν ᾖ, κ.τ.λ.; and takes, therefore, אשר יאמר to אבדה, which is, however, forced and improbable. The Vulgate and Luther omit those words entirely. In the English Version: "which *another* challengeth to be his," the word *another* is arbitrarily added.—*Whom the judges will condemn, he shall pay double to his neighbour*, that is, either the depositary for the intended fraud, or the witness for his false evidence, or the depositor for the false charge brought against his neighbour.

9. If the entrusted animal perishes by accident, death, or fracture, or is violently abducted by robbers (נשבה), *without witness* (אין ראה, about the Nom. Absol., see *Ewald*, Gram. § 592), then,

10. The depositary shall swear, that his statement is truthful; the proprietor is bound to accept this oath (ולקח בעליו), and the former makes no restitution (ולא ישלם). Already Onkelos adds to ולקח the word מומתא, oath; so explain also Rashi and Ebn Ezra. Abarbanel supplies: "the dead animal"; which, however, is, at least, inapplicable to נשבה, since the animal was not at hand. The depositary was, in such cases, fully exempted from all responsibility, for it was not in his power to prevent the loss. Some commentators believe, that, in such instances, the proprietor pays no wages to the keeper; for, according to their opinion, our text speaks of a שומר שכיר, see *supra*. But, if this were the case, it would be difficult to find any body willing to tend the flocks of another, as he is made responsible for accidents beyond the control of man.—The change of subjects in the two verbs, ולקח and ישלם, is not uncommon.

11. But if an animal is *stolen* from the depositary, he must restore it, as it may fairly be supposed that he was deficient in the necessary care and vigilance, under

hath not put his hand to his neighbour's goods. 8. For all manner of trespass, *whether it be* for ox, for ass, for sheep, for raiment, *or* for anything lost, [1]of which it is said that it is his, the cause of both parties shall come before the judges; *and* whom the judges will condemn, he shall pay double to his neighbour. 9. If a man delivereth to his neighbour an ass, or an ox, or a sheep, or any beast, to keep; and it dieth, or is hurt, or taken away, no man seeing *it:* 10. *Then* shall an oath of the Lord be between them both, that he hath not put his hand to his neighbour's goods, and the owner of it shall accept *thereof*, and he shall not make restitution: 11. And if it be stolen from him, he shall make restitution to the owner thereof. 12. If it be torn in pieces, *then* let him bring it *for* witness, *and* he shall not pay for that which is torn.— 13. And if a man borroweth *aught* of his neighbour, and it is hurt, or die, the owner thereof *being* not with it, he shall

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Which *another* challengeth to be his.

which condition alone he received his wages.

12. If the animal has been entirely torn by a wild beast, the guardian shall, as a proof of his innocence, bring a part or member of it with him (יביאהו עד), and is then free from penalty. Thus Ebn Ezra, Rashbam, and others (compare Am. iii. 12.)—Onkelos translates: ייתי סהדין, "let him bring witnesses"; in which rendering the suffix הוא would be unaccountable. Jonathan gives two different explanations: "he shall bring *him* witnesses" (so that יביאהו would stand instead of יביא אליו, which would, however, be very anomalous; see *Ewald*, Gr. § 556), or, "he shall bring him to the body of the lacerated animal"; but this supposes the reading עַד instead of עֵד, which is, moreover, connected with the following הטרפה. Thus has the Sept.: *ἄξει αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν θήραν*; and similarly the Vulgate: "deferat ad eum quod occisum est."—As an illustration of our verse according to the first interpretation, we quote the following passage from the laws of the Gentoos: "If the shepherd has led his cattle to a distant pasture, and an animal dies from any disease, in spite of all possible care on the part of the shepherd, he must bring to the proprietor the head, the tail, the forefoot, or any other part of the body, as a convincing proof of the truth of his statement; in such case, he is freed from all responsibility; but if he neglects that precaution, he must restitute the loss (see *Rosenm.*, Orient. i. p. 148).—Faithful to the principle, that the keeper is only answerable, if it was in his power to avert the accident, the Talmud (Bab. Kam. 15 *b.*) observes: "animals killed by a fox or marten must be paid for; animals torn by a wolf, a lion, a bear, or serpent, need not be restored."

18. About Property Borrowed from Another. Vers. 13, 14.

In systematical order the case is now treated, that a person has lent to another either an animal or a thing. If the proprietor received no hire for it, and the

שַׁלֵּם יְשַׁלֵּם׃ 14 אִם־בְּעָלָיו עִמּוֹ לֹא יְשַׁלֵּם אִם־שָׂכִיר הוּא בָּא
בִּשְׂכָרוֹ׃ ס 15 וְכִי־יְפַתֶּה אִישׁ
בְּתוּלָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא־אֹרָשָׂה וְשָׁכַב עִמָּהּ מָהֹר יִמְהָרֶנָּה לּוֹ לְאִשָּׁה׃

animal died, or the object was destroyed in the absence of the master, the borrower must restore the loss: for the guarding of the borrowed thing devolved upon him; but if the master was present, the borrower was not bound to pay for the loss, since the former might have protected his property, and would no doubt have done so, if it had been practicable. But if the master received hire for the borrowed animal or thing, the borrower had, in case of any accident, no further obligations; "it comes for his hire" (בא בשכרו); for the master, who derives profit from his property, must also be prepared for a damage, whilst that property is used by others. It is self-understood, that this last provision is applicable only if the borrower is not guilty of any deceitful or malicious intention.

13. בעליו אין־עמו, again an absolute construction like אין ראה, in ver. 9. The master might, for instance, as Ebn Ezra observes, plead against the borrower, that he imposed too heavy burdens upon the animal.

14. אם־שכיר הוא.—If the ox is not borrowed, but hired, the borrower receives no particular favour from the proprietor, since he pays for the use of the animal; and he is therefore not responsible for accidents like those who are permitted its gratuitous use. Whether in cases when such hired animal was stolen, the borrower was obliged to restore it or not, is not mentioned in our text; but the question has been treated in the Talmud (Bab. Mez. 94), and has been differently answered: according to Rabbi Meir, the borrower is like a שומר חנם, and is therefore *not* responsible; but in Rabbi Jehudah's opinion, he is like a שומר שכיר, and must therefore pay for the loss. Considering the wording of ver. 11, Rabbi Jehudah's interpretation seems to be more corresponding with the opinion of the legislator.

GENERAL MORAL LAWS. XXII. 15. TO XXIII. 19.

19. About Unchastity (Stuprum and Adulterium). Vers. 15, 16.

The extraordinary purity and the divinely moral character of the Mosaic legislation appears in no class of laws more strongly and clearly, than in those about violation of chastity (compare the seventh commandment, xx. 13). Here the legislator seems to disavow every clemency, and with inexorable severity to aim at the purest integrity of morals.

1. If a person seduces a *not betrothed* free virgin by persuasion or violence, he must pay the customary marriage-price (מֹהַר see *infra*) as imposed by her father, and take her to wife; nor is he allowed during his whole life to divorce her. But if the father refuses him as his son-in-law, he must pay the usual fine for disgracing the virgin, which was, according to Deut. xxii. 28, 29, fifty shekels of silver.

2. If she was betrothed or married to another man, and was *persuaded* to the criminal conduct, both were publicly stoned to death, "that the evil might be extirpated from among Israel." A virgin legally betrothed was considered a lawful wife; and could therefore not be separated from her intended husband without a bill of divorce.

3. If the seduction of a betrothed virgin, or of another's wife, was effected with *violence*, the man only suffered death. But violence was supposed in open fields, where the maiden or wife might have cried for help, without her voice reaching to inhabited places; so that she was in the predicament of one attacked by robbers, whilst, if the crime was committed in a town, such excuse cannot be pleaded.

4. If the seduced female was a servant,

surely pay *for it.* 14. *But* if the owner thereof *be* with it, he shall not pay for *it:* if it *be* a hired *thing*, it came for its hire.—15. And if a man enticeth a maid who is not betrothed, and lieth with her, he shall surely endow her to

the man was chastised, he had to bring a guilt-offering, and the priest must pray for expiation of his sin (Levit. xix. 20—22).

5. If a man accuses his newly-married wife of unchastity, the charge is investigated by the judges in the presence of her parents; if she is found innocent, the man must pay to her parents a hundred shekels for his calumny, and is never permitted to divorce her; but if she is found guilty: "then they shall bring out the female to the door of her father's house, and the men of her city shall stone her with stones that she die; because she hath wrought impiousness in Israel, to be unchaste in her father's house: so shalt thou put away evil from Israel" (Deut. xxii. 13—21). About the impressive and imposing ceremonies in cases of suspected faithlessness of a wife, see Numb. v. 11—31, ceremonies which, undoubtedly, were a most efficient preventive of adultery; compare *Maimonides*, Hilch. Naarah Bethulah; *Eben Haeser*, sect. 168, *et seq.*

It is easy to discover the leading principles of these laws: 1st. To shield virgins from permanent ignominy and disgrace in consequence of a momentary crime, by converting illicit intercourse into the lawful and sacred tie of matrimony: 2nd. To deter virgins and young men from unchastity; since the former could, without danger of death, marry no man except their seducers, after having once lost their innocence; and the latter were compelled to wed the disgraced females, at the same time losing the liberty ever to dismiss them: and, 3rd. To admonish betrothed or married women of their conjugal duties in the most impressive manner, and thus to protect the sanctity of matrimony from profanation by the most rigorous penalties; and even punishment of death can, from these exalted points of view, not appear exaggerated. Need we add, what excellent fruits these wise and most moral laws have produced in the Israelitish nation? since chastity and sacred reverence for the matrimonial duties are virtues which, since the real observance of the Mosaic law, have always flourished amongst them in a remarkable degree; and nowhere does the utter inability of Tacitus to comprehend the spirit of the Hebrew laws appear in a more striking manner than in his unguarded calumny with respect to the precepts under discussion: "Projectissima ad libidinem gens, alienarum concubitu abstinent; *inter se nihil illicitum.*" So much do national prejudice and religious fanaticism blind the judgment of even great and comprehensive minds. As a contrast to that remark of Tacitus, we call attention to the dictum of Bishop Gregoire: "that a striking resemblance of children to their parents, is oftener met with amongst Jews than amongst other nations" (Sic!).

The Koran (iv. 19) provides: "If your wives commit adultery, and four witnesses from among you testify this, imprison her in your house till death releases her or God shows her another way of deliverance." Further (xxiv. 4, *et seq.*): "But as to those who accuse women of reputation (of fornication or adultery), and cannot produce four witnesses, scourge them with eighty stripes, and receive not their testimony for ever, for such are infamous prevaricators; excepting those who shall afterwards repent." It is obvious, that both the difficulty of obtaining four eye-witnesses for the crime of adultery, and the severity of punishment in case of mistake on the part of the accuser, must almost render it impossible to call, in any instance, faithless wives to account. However, the spirit of those clauses is evidently in

16 אִם־מָאֵן יְמָאֵן אָבִיהָ לְתִתָּהּ לוֹ כֶּסֶף יִשְׁקֹל כְּמֹהַר הַבְּתוּלֹת׃

17 ס מְכַשֵּׁפָה לֹא תְחַיֶּה׃ 18 כָּל־שֹׁכֵב

accordance with the Mosaic laws.—A few comparisons from the Greek and Roman laws may be acceptable. Among the Athenians, if a man caught another man in the act of criminal intercourse with his wife, he might kill him with impunity. There was no adultery unless a married woman was concerned; but it was no adultery for a man to have connection with a married woman who prostituted herself, or who was engaged in selling anything in the agora. The husband might, if he pleased, take a sum of money from the adulterer, by way of compensation, and detain him till he found sureties for the payment. If the act of adultery was proved, the husband could no longer cohabit with his wife, under pain of losing his privileges as a citizen. The adulteress was excluded from all temples.—In the Roman law there was no adultery unless the female was married; the commerce with a widow or a virgin was *stuprum*. By the old law or custom, if the adulterer was caught in the fact, he was at the mercy of the injured husband, who might also punish with death his adulterous wife. Originally, the act of adultery might be punished by any person, as being a public offence. In the time of Augustus, the *Lex Julia de Adulteriis coercendis*, was enacted (B. C. 17). By this law, if a husband kept his wife after an act of adultery was known to him, and let the adulterer free, he was guilty of the offence of lenocinium. A woman, convicted of adultery, was mulcted in half her *dos*, and the third part of her property (*bona*), and banished to some miserable island, such as Seriphos, for instance. The adulterer was mulcted in half his property, and banished in like manner, but not to the same island as the woman. The adulterer and adulteress were subjected also to civil incapacities; but this law did not inflict the punishment of death on either party. But, by a constitution of Constantine, the offence in the adulterer was made capital. By the legislation of Justinian the adulteress was put into a convent, after being first whipped. If her husband did not take her out in two years, she was compelled to assume the habit, and to spend the rest of her life in the convent. The Julian law permitted the father to kill the adulterer and adulteress in certain cases. The husband might kill persons of a certain class, described in the law, whom he caught in the act of adultery with his wife; but he could not kill his wife. If the wife was divorced for adultery, the husband was entitled to retain part of the dos (*Wollaston*, Religion of Nature, pp. 141, 142. v. Ed.; see *Smith*, Antiq. p. 16, 17). The attentive reader will easily discover the differences between these gradually introduced, unconnected laws, and the systematic provisions of the Mosaic code. According to the Egyptian law, a woman who had committed adultery was sentenced to lose her nose (!), and the man was condemned to receive a bastinado of one thousand blows (!). If the latter had used force against a free woman, the punishment was still more barbarous (*προςίταξαν ἀποκόπτεσθαι τὰ αἰδοῖα. Diod.* i. 77).

15. *He shall surely endow her to be his wife.* The manner in which matrimonial alliances are concluded in the East, is too well known to require any comment; and the following extract from *Arvieux*'s Manners of the Bedouin Arabs (p. 119), will suffice for the illustration of this verse: "If a young man finds a girl to his taste, he requests her father, through one of his relatives, to permit his marriage with her. Now they negociate how many camels, sheep or horses the son-in-law is to give to the father for his daughter...... A man who marries, must, therefore, literally buy his wife; and the parents who have the greatest number of daughters are the richest. They are the chief wealth of a family...... The qualities of the girl and of the family, and the circumstances of

be his wife. 16. If her father utterly refuse to give her to him, he shall pay money according to the dowry of virgins.—17. A witch thou shalt not suffer to live.—18. Whoever lieth with a beast shall surely be put to

the suitor, are especially considered in the matter." For further accounts see *Rosenmüller*, Orient, i. p. 132—137. The judicial marriage-price (מהר) seems in general to have been fifty shekels (compare Hosea iii. 2, and Exod. xxi. 32; Deut. xxii. 29, and Levit. xxvii. 3). Since thus the daughters form the most valuable *property* of the parents, this law is here inserted immediately after the violation of property; compare the sacred narratives concerning Jacob and Laban; Shechem and Dinah; David and Michal (see also *Homer*, Odyss. xi. 281; Iliad, xi. 243, *et seq.*; *Herod.*, i. 196; *Strabo*, xvi. 745; *Tacitus*, Germ. xviii). However, according to Mosaism, the מהר was not a price of purchase, for not the father, but the bride received it to enable her to enter with proper dignity into the house of her future husband. Besides the מהר, the latter generally gave presents to the parents (מתן, Gen. xxxiv. 12, or מגדנות, Gen. xxiv. 53), in order to gain their favour, and to show them respect and affection. The father could sometimes dispense with the מהר (Josh. xv. 16; 1 Sam. xviii. 25); and, in some instances, he even gave his daughter a rich dowry (Josh. xv. 19; Judg. i. 15). Thus we see even common Oriental customs ennobled in the Old Testament, in harmony with the more dignified position of of the women among the Israelites (see about מהר in general, *Saalschütz*, Mos. R. p. 730—741). And thus the later Jewish tradition has stipulated the Mohar more in favour of the wife than of her parents, as, at the death of her husband, or in the case of divorce, she received a certain sum (a virgin two hundred Sus, a widow one hundred; see *Eben Haeser*, Sect. 115).—פתה, in Piel, *to infatuate*, to win by false pretences and promises; therefore, פֶּתִי, a fool, an infatuated man; and the explanation of this word is aptly expressed in the verse: פתי יאמין לכל דבר, "a fool believes everything" (Prov. xiv. 15). אֹרָשָׂה, Pual of ארש, in Pause, instead of אֹרְשָׂה. According to Gesenius, ארש is identical with ערש, and as עֶרֶשׂ signifies bed, מְאֹרָשָׂה is one who is destined as bed-fellow (Arabic, عرس husband or wife, عروس, one espoused).

16. About the phrase כסף ישקל, see note on xxi. 32; and שקל is here rather a weight than a coin. The מֹהַר הַבְּתוּלֹת for such cases of persuasion and seduction is, as mentioned above, fifty shekels (Deut. xxii. 28, 29).

20. Law against Witchcraft. Ver. 17.

A witch (מכשפה) *thou shalt not suffer to live.* As the magical art implies the imposition, that those who practise it are inspired and supported by certain demons and deities, it is, in fact, a negation of the unity of God, and, as a hidden polytheism, deserves, quite logically after the theocratical principles of Mosaism, punishment of death (see note to xx. 2, 3; *infra*, ver. 19. Compare *Maimon.* Mor.Neb. iii. 37). Hereto must be added, that the sorcerers, by their fraudulent arts, easily prey upon the credulity of the people, and enrich themselves by illegitimate means, even irrespective of the evil, that the notions of the multitude are thereby necessarily disturbed and led astray from faith into superstition. Thus the material and spiritual damage caused by sorcery was sufficiently momentous to justify even capital punishment; for it is "an abomination to the Lord, for which He expelled the heathens before the Israelites" (Deut. xviii. 10—12); and the legislator solemnly called down upon the head of those who give themselves up to such

עִם־בְּהֵמָה מוֹת יוּמָת ׃ ס 19 זֹבֵחַ לָאֱלֹהִים
יָחֳרָם בִּלְתִּי לַיהוָה לְבַדּוֹ ׃ 20 וְגֵר לֹא־תוֹנֶה וְלֹא תִלְחָצֶנּוּ כִּי־גֵרִים

pernicious arts their own blood, if, in conseqnence of their aberrations, they suffer the death of lapidation (Lev. xix. 31; xx. 6. Compare Sanhedr. 65 *a*).—This severity is further accountable by the great prevalence of this evil in the East; in Egypt and Babylon, the sorcerers or magicians belonged to the caste of the priests (Exod. vii. 11; Dan. ii. 2); and, among the Israelites, kings even were addicted to such practices (2 Kings xvii. 17; Isa. ii. 6; Mich. v. 11). But, according to the Mosaic notions, it is absolutely impossible to acknowledge sorcerers or witches, and those who pretend to be such must be considered as impious and nefarious impostors. Even the idea of a Satan, as an evil principle, is foreign to Mosaism, and has only been borrowed in later periods from the Babylonian mythology. How much fanaticism, madness, and bloodshed, might have been avoided, if these simple and pure ideas of Mosaism had always been kept in view! The history of the Christian church would not have been disgraced by the fatal absurdities of witch-trials. "The seventeenth verse of the twenty-second chapter of Exodus," observes a recent commentator, "was the war-cry of the clergy against myriads of aged and defenceless women.... So late as 1716, a woman and her daughter of nine years old were hanged at Huntingdon for raising storms by witchcraft. These deplorable statutes were not repealed till 1736... In Germany, not less than one hundred thousand women and children are said to have suffered a cruel death under the stupid and ferocious persecution of witches that disgraced the sixteenth century.... A sound lawyer like Sir Matthew Hale, and an enlightened scholar like Sir Thomas Brown, were both drawn into the same vortex of folly and cruelty."

The sorcerers were, therefore, capitally punished by Moses only because they wished, as impostors, to make the people believe in their futile arts, but not because he himself ascribed to them any power or any connection with idols; for if so, he would tacitly have admitted their existence, and a certain degree of influence, which, however, he everywhere most emphatically denies; and the very names and designations of the idols describe them as illusions and unreal phantoms.—About the different kinds of sorcery in use among the idolatrous neighbours of the Israelites we shall speak in their proper places.—About the signification of מכשף, see on vii. 11, where this word is used for tamers of serpents. Witchcraft, whether practised by men or women, was, of course, equally criminal (Lev. xx. 27, איש או אשה), but, in the opinion of the Talmud (Sanhedr. 44 *b*), Maimonides (Moreh. iii. 37), and others, women are more given to such arts than men; and, lest ill-placed clemency towards the weaker sex destroy the efficiency of this law, the feminine, מכשפה, is here preferred to the masculine form. The unusual expression, לא תחיה, instead of מות תומת, is, according to tradition, employed in order to point to the greater severity to be used with regard to such crimes, which might be attended with the ruin of many. Sorcery was, in the Athenian law, also punished with death, whilst the Romans originally considered it criminal only if it had injured the interests of others (*Wachsmuth*, Hellen. Alt. ii. p. 211; *Rein*, Criminalrecht der Roemer p. 902 *et seq.*).

21. Against Coition with Beasts. Ver. 18.

The law about pagan witchcraft leads the legislator to the interdiction of unnatural lasciviousness or coition with beasts; which abomination prevailed also among many Oriental nations, even before the times of Moses, so extensively, that it formed, in some districts of Egypt, for instance, the Mendesian, a part of

death.—19. He who sacrificeth to *any* god, save to the Lord only, he shall be extirpated.—20. And the stranger

their idolatrous rites. Of all the aberrations and monstrosities to which the physical and moral nature of man may degenerate, this is the most hideous and heinous, and the morals of a state must indeed be rotten to the very core, where such an abomination is permitted. Death of the man and death of the beast is, therefore, the just punishment of this crime; and the legislator, impelled by a just horror against such atrocities, addresses a most emphatic and solemn warning to the nation, to refrain from that vice, in which admonition he represents even the earth as sympathetic against its hideousness: "And the land is defiled: therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants.... That the land vomit not you out also, when you defile it, as it vomited out the nations that were before you. For whosoever will commit any of these abominations, even the souls that commit them shall be cut off from among their people" (Lev. xviii. 25—29). In this passage (ver. 22) another kind of unnatural lust is forbidden under penalty of death, carnal intercourse between men; which crime indicated already, in Sodom and Gomorrah, the highest degree of immorality (Gen. xix. 5); and which leads certainly, by the dissolution of the matrimonial ties, not less fatally to the inevitable ruin of a community; of which fact the Roman empire under the Cæsars, offers the most obvious and most melancholy instance.

22. Repetition of the Law against Polytheism. Vers. 19.

It has been demonstrated above (on xx. 2, 3), that the belief in the One God of Israel, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, who has led the people out of Egypt, is the innermost centre of Mosaism; that God is the invisible sovereign of the land; and that idol-worship would be rebellion against the acknowledged Lord of the nation; and hence it follows logically, that such crime must be punished capitally, as it would bring the theocratical state into disorganization and decay: it is not only a religious, but also a political crime; it is high treason against state and church. From the same principle an idolatrous town was to be entirely destroyed (Deut. xiii. 14, *et seq.*); and blasphemy, desecration of the Sabbath, sooth-saying and sorcery were to be punished with death (see note on xix. 6). —*He who sacrificeth to any God.* "As the offering of sacrifices was the chief part of divine service, all the other branches of unlawful worship were contained therein" (*Rosenmüller*).—לאלהים signifies here strange gods, as in xx. 3, אלהים אחרים, as the Samaritan text reads here also; and Rashbam and others observe, that the Kamets beneath ל, which implies the definite article, points to those strange gods spoken of before. Targum Onkelos לטעות עממיא, "to the idols of the nations."—יָחֳרָם *shall be extirpated.* חָרַם in Hiph., properly to declare holy, to devote, to consecrate; therefore to devote to God; as, for instance, Jericho and other Canaanitish towns, were devoted to God, that is, were so entirely destroyed, that they were never again built up (see Josh. vi. 17—19, 26). Therefore החרים, applied to men, signifies, to extirpate, to exterminate (compare Lev. xxvii. 29). And in our case, the transgressor is literally consecrated to the true God, as he intended to forsake Him and follow idols in His stead. Sept., well preserving the etymology, θανάτῳ ἐξολοθρευθήσεται; Vulgate, simply, occidetur, as Targ. Onk., יתקטל.—*Save to the Lord only.* The Jewish expositors find in these words the prohibition, not to sacrifice, and in any way to give adoration to angels or other similar beings; but only and exclusively to God, the Creator of the Universe.

הֱיִיתֶם בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 21 כָּל־אַלְמָנָה וְיָתוֹם לֹא תְעַנּוּן׃ 22 אִם־
עַנֵּה תְעַנֶּה אֹתוֹ כִּי אִם־צָעֹק יִצְעַק אֵלַי שָׁמֹעַ אֶשְׁמַע צַעֲקָתוֹ׃

23. Laws concerning the Poor, the Strangers, Widows and Orphans, Vers. 20—23, and XXIII. 9.

The thread of the penal and civil laws is interrupted by a series of statutes, which appeal only to the heart and to humanity, with regard to which no penalty is fixed, and which spread a magic charm of feeling and sentiment over a code, which usually contains little more than the abstract and dry right of criminal cases. Moses will not only educate *citizens*, he will also train *men*, and whilst forming the morals of the latter, he prepares them, in a safe although indirect way, for the fulfilment of their obligations as citizens. Political and moral education have by Moses been concentrated into one focus; and by basing patriotism upon virtue, he promotes the prosperity of the state, whilst he seems only intent upon advancing the rectitude of the individuals. Thus Moses has solved in his laws a problem, which has baffled the wisdom of all later legislators, and which is still one of the most perplexing questions of our civil government; namely, how indigence and vagrancy might be obviated. The Mosaic law knows no *beggars;* neither in the Pentateuch, nor in any other book of the Old Testament, is the word mentioned, and only in Ps. cix. 10, it is alluded to as an extraordinary curse of God. In the New Testament they are sometimes mentioned (St. Mark x. 46; St. Luke xviii. 35, etc.); but then they are blind or lame men, or other invalids, who sit in the neighbourhood of the temple, or before the doors of the wealthy. Beggary can, in fact, only prevail in a much more advanced or artificial state of social order, when the property of the individuals is very unequal, and the very poor deem it the duty of the very rich to maintain them from their superfluity without their own exertions. But in the Mosaic state the landed property was distributed among all the Israelites in equal portions, which remained to every individual as an inalienable right; whence it follows, that there could neither be a class of men helplessly poor, nor a privileged opulent nobility, which might become dangerous to liberty and equality; there were no "latifundia," which according to the testimony of Pliny (xviii. 7) have ruined Italy and the provinces.

But yet an Israelitish citizen might, with or without his fault, fall into poverty, by bad crops, or indolence, or prodigality; and the legislator has foreseen the possibility of such cases so clearly, that he exclaims with emphasis: "The needy shall not cease from amidst the land" (Deut. xv. 11). For such emergencies two ways were left open: Either the poor man could sell himself to an Israelite as a slave, which, according to the notions of the people, was in no way a degrading or a miserable lot, since, as we have shown (on xxi. 1—11), not only the greatest clemency was enjoined towards him as a brother and fellow-citizen, but he went out after a service of six years, and in the epoch of the jubilee received back his old paternal fields, and thus was restored into all the rights and privileges of a free citizen. So far the removal of the difficulty lay in the hands of the poor themselves; and this expedient must especially have been salutary in such cases, when his poverty was a consequence of indolence; for by entering the house of a master as a servant, he was not only a warning example to others similarly disposed, but he was almost compelled to accustom himself to habits of activity and industry. But there are innumerable cases, when the poor might, by a timely loan, maintain his independent position and recover his former prosperity. An unexpected, extraordinary misfortune might reduce to a temporary embarrassment an

thou shalt neither vex, nor oppress him: for you were strangers in the land of Egypt. 21. You shall not afflict any widow or orphan. 22. If thou afflict them in any way, [1]indeed, if they cry to me, I will surely hear

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—And they cry at all unto me.

honest and respected man who would feel an excruciating humiliation in serving as a slave. And in such contingencies the wise and humane legislator makes it an imperative duty of the rich, to lend him a sum of money sufficient to free him from his perplexity, and with such emphasis does he enjoin that command, that some antiquaries have, though unjustly, attributed to it the character of a civil law, rather to be enforced by the authorities, than that of a moral precept: "If there be among you a poor man of one of thy brethren within any of thy gates in thy land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not harden thy heart, nor shut thy hand from thy poor brother. But thou shalt open thy hand wide to him, and shalt surely lend him sufficient for his need in that which he wanteth. Beware that there be not a thought in thy wicked heart, saying, The seventh year, the year of release is at hand [for in the Sabbath-year debts could not be exacted]; and thy eye be evil against thy poor brother, and thou givest him nought; and he cry to the Lord against thee, and it be sin to thee" (Deut. xv. 7—11). And in another passage further very sympathetic and feeling precepts are given with respect to such loans: "When thou lendest thy brother anything, thou shalt not go into his house to fetch his pledge. Thou shalt stand abroad, and the man to whom thou dost lend shall bring out the pledge abroad to thee. And if the man be poor, thou shalt not sleep with his pledge. In any case thou shalt deliver him the pledge again when the sun goeth down, that he may sleep in his own raiment, and bless thee"; but in order clearly to stamp these laws with a purely moral character, the legislator concludes: "and it shall be righteousness to thee before the Lord thy God" (ולך תהיה צדקה לפני יי׳ אלהיך, Deut. xxiv. 10—13).—Thus judicious loans are in the Mosaic code justly preferred to mere alms (גדול המלוה יותר מן הנותן, Talm.), and if the Rabbinical law appears in one respect in a more favourable light than in another, it is especially in the further development of the Mosaic laws concerning charity, which everywhere exhibit a beautiful, harmonious blending of sentiment and reason. Even Tacitus, who contorts almost all the other institutions of the Israelites, awards to the latter at least the praise of unshaken brotherly love and ready charity (Hist. v. 5: apud ipsos fides obstinata, misericordia in promptu). Already in the time of king Ahab, compassion and charity were, among the heathen nations, acknowledged as a distinguishing characteristic of the Israelites; for the Syrians say to their monarch after a lost battle: "Behold now, we have heard that the kings of the house of Israel are merciful kings" (1 Kings xx. 31); and the Talmud proposes the general remark: "He who has no pity does not belong to the descendants of Abraham" (*Talm.* Bez. 32).

As the *strangers*, *the widows*, and *orphans* generally, are in the same helpless condition as the poor, they are expressly included in the same laws of benevolence and consideration. We pass by the merely ethical admonitions of pity and charity towards these unfortunate classes of the population; admonitions, which appeal to the feelings with the most affecting ardour, and repeatedly enjoined as they are, are almost in themselves sufficient to secure for the oppressed the sympathy and assistance of the wealthy. But Moses did not content himself with vague exhortations; although he thought highly of the excellence of human nature, he yet did not wish to leave the fate of

23 וְחָרָה אַפִּי וְהָרַגְתִּי אֶתְכֶם בֶּחָרֶב וְהָיוּ נְשֵׁיכֶם אַלְמָנוֹת וּבְנֵיכֶם
יְתֹמִים׃ פ

the unfortunate to the fluctuations of humours and chances; and therefore he gave positive laws in their favour, and secured to them a regular and certain competence; charity was withdrawn from the doubtful personal pleasure of the rich, and was by legal precepts placed upon a solid basis; it was raised into a *civil* duty; it could no more degrade and humiliate the poor, since it was regulated by the law; and poverty lost its bitterest sting, as the poor could allay its miseries by lawful and valid claims. For Moses ordained:—

1. The spontaneous produce of the fields, the orchards, and the vineyards, in every seventh year (שמטה), when they were not cultivated, belonged to the poor as well as to the proprietors (Exod. xxiii. 4). 2. In every harvest, the borders (פאות) of the fields were to be reserved and left to the poor and the stranger; according to tradition, these borders must, at least, be the sixtieth part of the field; and this law applied to all sorts of corn, legumes, the vine, olive-, nut-, and date-trees, etc. No poor could be refused, and none was to be favoured in this privilege (see Lev. xix. 9). 3. The proprietor was not allowed to glean the vineyard after the gathering (Deut. xxiv. 21), nor take up the grapes which fell off; all this also belonged to the poor and the stranger (Lev. xix. 10). 4. "When thou cuttest down thy harvest in thy field, and hast forgotten a sheaf in the field, thou shalt not go again to fetch it: it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, and for the widow: that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all the work of thy hands" (Deut. xxiv. 19). 5. "When thou beatest thy olive-tree, thou shalt not go over the boughs again: it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, and for the widow" (ibid. ver. 20); and, as the legislator loves to introduce historical allusions, he adds: "and thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in the land of Egypt: therefore I command thee to do this thing" (ver. 22). The school of misery through which Israel had passed in Egypt, shall, in future happier times, be for them a school of virtue and moral purification. 6. "At the end of three years thou shalt bring forth all the tithe of thy increase the same year, and shalt lay it up within thy gates: and the Levite (because he hath no part nor inheritance with thee), and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, who are within thy gates, shall come and shall eat and be satisfied, that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all the work of thy hand which thou doest" (Deut. xiv. 28, 29; and in Deut. xxvi. 12—15, a blessing is prescribed, which is to be pronounced on such cheering occasions). These common meals, like those celebrated on festivals (Deut. xvi. 11—14), naturally brought the different classes of the population into continual contact, and gladdened certainly the heart of the distressed more than a cold distant gift, offered with the appearance of haughty superiority. Thus they could not but exercise a salutary influence both morally and socially; a striking contrast to the customs of the Egyptians, who considered it a perfect abomination to eat with strangers at the same table.

These are the general laws, in which all helpless classes of the nation were equally considered and regarded. It is evident, that, with these institutions, pauperism could not exist in the Mosaic state; and the principle of equality which pervades the whole Biblical legislation, attempts, and in a great measure succeeds, to remove also the glaring unevenness between the wealthy and the needy. But the individual kinds of poor are, besides, singly and separately provided for by the humane legislator, as will be specified in the following verses.

20. "And the stranger thou shalt neither vex nor oppress him: for you

their cry; 23. And my wrath shall be kindled, and I will kill you with the sword, and your wives shall be widows, and your children orphans.—24. If thou lendest

were strangers in the land of Egypt." This reason for the duty of benevolence towards the poor is, in another passage, pronounced still more distinctly: "And thou shalt not oppress a stranger; for you know *the heart of the stranger*, since you were strangers in the land of Egypt" (xxiii. 9); and this experience was certainly, above all things, calculated to teach the Israelites compassion for the strangers. Not only had they suffered the most ignominious oppression, but witnessed the inveterate hatred which the Egyptians bear to *all* foreigners, and the cruelties which they exhibited against them. And, generally, the duty of hospitality, which was liberally practised in ancient times, as it still is at present in the East, seems to have been scrupulously exercised by the Hebrews. (Compare Gen. xviii. 3; xix. 2; xxiv. 25; Exod. ii. 20; Judg. xix. 6; compare Odyss. VI. 207, 208: *πρὸς γὰρ Διός εἰσιν Ἅπαντες ξεῖναί τε πτωχοί τε*; see *De Wette*, Arch. § 264). We have already alluded to the probable difference between the two kinds of strangers specified in the Mosaic law, the גרים and תושבים. We need scarcely go further than compare Exodus xii. 29 with vers. 45 and 48, and it will be obvious that the גרים (from גור, to settle somewhere), by undergoing the act of circumcision as the sign of the covenant, enter into the community of the Hebrew commonwealth; whilst the תושבים (from ישב, to dwell, sojourn) are foreigners, who have taken their temporary abode in the boundaries of the Hebrew realm, and who might quit it without being, by any remaining connection, united with Mosaism. From this point of view, those passages are, we believe, easily and unforcedly explained (see on xii. 19, 45). The Talmud and the Rabbins call the former class of strangers generally גרי צדק or גרי ברית (strangers of justice or of the covenant), and the latter גרי שער (strangers of the gate). In Lev. xxv. 47, גר תושב is used, in which phrase Ewald (Antiq. p. 245) takes both words as identical; but גר is the generic appellation, whilst תושב denotes the specific class. Untenable is the difference which Michaelis (Mos. R. ii. § 138) establishes: "Every body who does not possess landed property is a גר; he who has no house of his own is a תושב." The distinction is, according to xii. 19, 45, more of a religious than of a civil character, and it can import little with respect to the admittance to the paschal-lamb, whether a person possesses fields and houses or not. The translation of the Septuagint, which renders תושב by *πάροικος* (sojourner), and גר by *προσήλυτος* (proselyte), is perfectly appropriate; the former is only an external local connection, the other, an internal religious communion. (Suidas explains *προσήλυτοι* correctly: *οἱ ἐξ ἐθνῶν προσεληλυθότες καὶ κατὰ τοὺς θείους πολιτευόμενοι νόμους*; and in Isa. lvi. 3 the proselyte is circumscribed by בן־הנכר הנלוה אל־יי׳; see *infra* at the end of this note). And as the stranger (גר) has, by circumcision, adopted the covenant of Israel, he has, in every respect, the same rights and duties as the native Israelite (האזרח; Lev. xxiv. 22; Num. xv. 14—16, 29). Both with regard to political and personal privileges, he enjoys perfect equality with the descendants of Jacob. This is the fundamental principle, which renders it almost superfluous to enumerate all the individual laws concerning the stranger: that they had in the courts of justice equal rights with the Israelites; that, in cases of justifiable homicide, they had the privilege of seeking protection in the cities of refuge; that they were bound to attend the reading of the Law at the Feast of Tabernacles every seventh year; participated in the Pesach; were subjected to the same laws of incest and matrimony; had to

24 אִם־כֶּסֶף ׀ תַּלְוֶה אֶת־עַמִּי אֶת־הֶעָנִי עִמָּךְ לֹא־תִהְיֶה לוֹ כְּנֹשֶׁה

observe the same precepts concerning sacrifices and purifications; were obliged to keep the Sabbath and the Day of Atonement; to abstain from eating blood and forbidden meat (נבלה וטרפה; see, however, Deut. xiv. 21); and, in a word, from every thing which would be an abomination in an Israelite. (Very numerous are the passages regarding these laws; the principal are: Exod. xii. 44, 49; xx. 10; xxiii. 12; Lev. xvi. 29; xvii. 8, 9, 10, 15; xviii. 26; xx. 2; xxiv. 16; xxii. 18; xxiv. 22; Num. ix. 14; xv. 14—16, 29; xix. 10, etc.; xxxv. 15; Deut. i. 16; v. 14; x. 18, 19; xiv. 21; xxiv. 17; xxvii. 19; xxix. 10—14; xxxi. 10, 12). And so impressively and warmly does Moses enjoin the duties towards strangers, that he expressly commands: ואהבת לו כמוך, "thou shalt love him like thyself" (Lev. xix. 24); it appears almost, that he wished rather to encourage the admission of strangers into the Hebrew state than to prevent it; so that the reproach, that Moses gave blind and narrow-minded laws, which excluded every contact with other nations, is one of those traditional prejudices which disappear at a more comprehensive and thorough investigation of the sacred writings. The reader will thus be able duly to appreciate the heedless aspersion of Tacitus (Hist. v. 5), "that the Hebrews bore enmity and hatred to all strangers" (adversus omnes alios hostile odium). Winer (Bibl. Dict. i. p. 380), observes: "A perfect isolation of the Hebrew people was in no way the design of the Mosaic law; for, in Solomon's time, there lived 153,600 strangers in Palestine (2 Chron. ii. 16)..... and the legal treatment of the stranger was more humane among the Hebrews than in the earlier times among the Romans, and even the Athenians." Even Ezekiel (xlvii. 21—23) assigns, in the distribution of the ideal land of Israel, to the stranger equal property and equal inheritance with the native Israelites; and Nehem. xiii. 3 (ויבדילו כל ערב מישראל) proves no *expulsion* of the stranger, but merely a segregation of the Ammonites and Moabites (ver. 1).

For policy and historical reminiscences dictated some exceptions from the laws concerning strangers: "The Ammonite and the Moabite shall not come into the congregation of the Lord, even to their tenth generation shall they not enter into the congregation of the Lord for ever" (Deut. xxiii. 4). The Edomites, who are so nearly akin to the Israelites, and the Egyptians, in whose country the Hebrews had dwelt so many centuries, could, in the third generation, that is, the grandchildren of those who immigrated into Canaan, be admitted in the Hebrew community (vers. 9, 10); and the members of other heathen nations no doubt after a proportionate period. This precept was necessary, if the purity of the Mosaic religion was really to be preserved; the pagan strangers must first, by education and habit, be inured to the notions and religious rites of the Hebrews, before they could, without danger, be received as autonomous members of the state. Besides, castrated persons and the offspring of public prostitutes (ממזרים) were entirely excluded, in order rigidly to deter from unnatural abominations and criminal immorality. The milder the wise legislator is in securing to everybody his human rights, the severer he is entitled to be in the punishment of violated divine duties. Even confederacies with heathen nations were not unconditionally prohibited; and Hebrew history teaches us, for instance, that David had concluded an alliance with the kings of Tyre and Hamath, and that Solomon stood in a similar relation at least with the former monarch, although his connection with the queen of Sheba is less distinct. And if the prophets yet warned against foreign allies, they were actuated rather by political than religious motives; for they considered it particularly imprudent to enter into leagues with such mighty states as Egypt, Assyria or Babylon, whose far superior power must, as those wise and

money to *any of* my people *that is* poor by thee, thou shalt not be to him [1]like a creditor; [2]thou shalt not lay

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—As an usurer. [2] Neither shalt thou.

inspired men foresaw, necessarily become fatal to the Israelitish commonwealth, and, in fact, did become so in most cases; just as Frederick the Great considered it dangerous to call in the aid of Russia against Sweden, because, as that monarch said prophetically enough, "we must never let loose the bear" (see *Mich.* M. R. i. § 61; *De Wette*, Arch. § 143, note *b*, and § 150 to end). It is, therefore, an incontrovertible truth, that although the people of Israel remained in opposition to the heathen *nations*, they freely allowed the *individuals* to join the Hebrew community as soon as they promised perfect obedience to the law (compare *Lengerke*, Ken. p. 489—495; *Hengstenb.* Pent. ii. p. 557—559). It is, however, one of the most beautiful and most ardently longed for hopes of the Messianic predictions, once to see all the nations of the earth in a happy alliance with Israel (Isa. ii. 2, *et seq.*; xlii. 6; xlix. 6; lvi. 6, *et seq.* etc). Nevertheless, a *missionary* activity for the conversion of heathens was exercised only at a very late epoch of Jewish history, and was then, after a short period, altogether and for ever abandoned (*Josephus*, Antiq. XX. ii. 3; XIII. ix. 1, xi. 3). The Rabbins have rather hindered than facilitated the admission of strangers into the Hebrew covenant; and the Jews are, at present, perhaps, among all confessions and sects, those who favour proselytism the least.

It is self-evident, that all precepts concerning strangers apply only to the גרי צדק, since the other class, the גרי שער, are only tolerated foreigners. These latter remain, according to the Talmudical expositions, essentially heathens; but, lest their example become injurious and dangerous to the religious purity of the Hebrew citizens, they were required strictly to adhere to the seven so-called laws of Noah (שבע מצות בני נח), binding upon all men, which interdicted blasphemy, idolatry, murder, incest as regards the forbidden degrees of marriage, plunder, disobedience against the authorities of the state, and the eating of flesh cut from a living beast (אבר מן החי, see *Talmud*, Sanhedr. 56. *a*, 59. *a*). The גרי שער were naturally excluded from the participation of the paschal-lamb, and of the holy bread (Exod. xii. 45; Levit. xxii. 10), but they enjoyed the privileges of the cities of refuge (Numb. xxxv. 15); they were entitled to relief if they were poor (Levit. xxv. 35); interest on loans granted to them was forbidden, and it was likewise enjoined not to oppress them in any way (ver. 36); they were allowed to acquire property, and even to possess Hebrew servants (ver. 47); but they could also, like a foreign slave, be sold to an Israelite as an hereditary property (ver. 45).

The גרי צדק entered into the community of Hebrew citizens by the solemn ceremonies of circumcision (מילה), baptism (טבילה), and of a sacrifice (קרבן), (compare *Cusari*, i. 115). It is self-understood, that after these acts they were expected to resign every connection with their paternal gods, and even with their idolatrous relatives (*Tacitus*, Hist. V. v. iii: "Transgressi in morem eorum idem usurpant—circumcidunt genitalia—nec quicquam prius imbuuntur quam contemnere deos, exuere patriam, parentes, liberos (?), fratres vilia habere). About the antiquity of *baptism* as a necessary ceremony or sacrament, in embracing Judaism, even ancient authorities offer contradictory opinions. According to some authorities it is scarcely older than the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, although it might, as a natural lustration, have been in use on such occasions from a very remote period (see *Talmud*, Jebam. 76, *a.*; Abodah Sarah, 57, *a.*, 59, *a.*; Berach. 47, *b.*; Ketub. 11, *a.*; *Maimonides*, Hilch. Isa. Biah. xiii. xiv; Joreh Deah, cclxviii).

21. The particular laws concerning

F F

לֹא־תְשִׂימוּן עָלָיו נֶשֶׁךְ׃ 25 אִם־חָבֹל תַּחְבֹּל שַׂלְמַת רֵעֶךָ עַד־בֹּא

the *widow* are: "If a priest's daughter be a widow, or divorced, and have no child, and return to her father's house, as in her youth, she shall eat of her father's food;" but there shall no stranger eat thereof (Levit. xxii. 13): 2nd. "Thou shalt not take the widow's raiment to pledge" (Deut. xxiv. 17; compare Job xxiv. 3, where even the act of taking a necessary animal of a widow or of an orphan as a pledge, is characterized as wickedness): 3rd. A High-priest was not allowed to marry a widow (Levit. xxi. 14; compare Eze. xliv. 22). Besides these laws a kind and considerate treatment of the widows is, in numerous passages, emphatically enjoined, and their oppression is most severely denounced by the prophets (Deut. xxvii. 19; Zechar. vii. 10; Isa. x. 2; Jer. vii. 6; Eze. xxii. 7; Mal. iii. 5, etc). About the right of inheritance on the part of the widow, the Mosaic law contains no regulations; she probably remained in the house of the first-born, or any other child who had the duty to maintain her. The *orphans*, being almost the most helpless class of all destitute persons, are generally included in the precepts concerning the poor, the stranger, and the widow, and everywhere considered with most affectionate benevolence.

22. "Behold, if *one* person oppresses a poor person, or a stranger, or a widow, the punishment falls on the whole community" (*Ebn Ezra*; compare תענה, ver. 22, and והרגתי אתכם, ver. 23). Rashi, Winer and others, consider the construction of this phrase as an aposiopesis, supplying thus: "if thou oppress him, *I shall punish thee;* for if he," etc. similar to Gen. iv. 15. But we take more simply כי in the very frequent signification of *indeed!* as in iii. 7; iv. 25.—The form עַנֵּה, is infinitivus absolutus, instead of עַנּוֹת; similar forms are כַּלֵּה, 1 Sam. iii. 12; הַכֵּה, Deut. xiii. 16; אַבֵּד, Jer. xii. 17; לַמֵּד, Jer. xxxii. 33, etc.

23. The punishment of hardheartedness against the weak is pronounced with extraordinary emphasis, and a severe "measure for measure" is threatened.

If we cast one glance more on the laws of Moses regarding the stranger, the poor, the widow and the orphan, we cannot but acknowledge that a refreshing spirit of brotherly love pervades every part of these injunctions. The ideas, that all men are children of the same father, that everybody possesses his property only as a loan, and an act of grace of Him to whom belongs the world and its abundance; that, therefore, he who gives to the poor not only "lendeth to the Lord," but restores to Him merely a small atom of all the bountiful gifts which He daily showers upon him: these, and all the kindred ideas of benevolence, humility, fear of God, and love of mankind, are visibly impressed upon these incomparable laws. Mosaism is a doctrine both theoretical and practical, both religious and moral, calculated both to enlighten the mind and to warm the heart; a religion of faith and of deed; of monotheism and of love. But those two characteristics are not opposed to each other; they are scarcely different, they converge in the same point, they are the emanations of the same power. "He who oppresseth the poor reproacheth his Maker; but he who honoureth Him hath mercy on the poor" (Prov. xiv. 31): "he who doth not redeem his brother, doth not give his expiation to God" (Psalm xlix. 8). The love of the poor is based on the love of God, the one supports and strengthens the other. "God accepteth not the persons of princes, nor regardeth the rich more than the poor! for they all *are* the work of His hand" (Job xxxiv. 19; compare Malachi ii. 10); before God all mortals are equals; all worldly greatness is vanity; all are created beings, insignificant before the majesty of God; and this idea suffices to eradicate pride and haughtiness of the heart. "The rich and the poor meet together: the Lord is the Maker of them all"; however different the earthly

upon him [1]interest. 25. If thou at all takest thy neighbour's raiment to pledge, thou shalt return it to him by

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Usury.

positions of men are, they have that one great and sacred point of contact, that they all bear the image of God, that they have an internal and everlasting affinity, which has its origin in an imperishable boon; and this conviction precludes overweening conduct towards a fellow-man, and teaches humility and genuine benevolence. Thus the belief in God is no barren doctrine; its first and most precious offspring is love to mankind; and brotherly love again is not left alone and unsupported, but is powerfully and indestructibly connected with the belief in God; thus Mosaism combines God and men, heaven and earth, eternity and time, the intellect and the heart—and in uniting everything sacred and sublime in one all-comprising point, it bore in it, from the beginning, the germ of a universal and eternal religion.

24. About Loans and Interests. Ver. 24.

We have already observed, that Moses commanded as a religious duty of charity, to assist persons in reduced circumstances with timely loans (Deut. xv. 7—11), and that the lender had sufficient guarantees for his advances in the harvests, the houses, the beasts, and, if necessary, in the persons of his debtors. Imprisonment or torture, in cases of insolvency, are nowhere mentioned in the Mosaic code; those means of punishment were only later introduced, according to the juridical practice of the Romans. The conduct of heartless creditors, who sometimes deprived their debtors of the most indispensable utensils, and took even their wives and children from them, was severely denounced by the prophets and teachers in Israel (2 Kings iv. 1; Neh. v. 5; Isa. l. 1). In the Sabbath-year, debts could not even be demanded back from Israelites whose fields then rested, and yielded no harvest (Deut. xv. 1, *et seq.*), but to refuse loans, because the Sabbath-year was near, is described as abject baseness of the heart (ver. 9, see p. 429). The humane and lenient character of Mosaism is again strikingly evident in these precepts, which appear to still greater advantage, if compared with the Roman laws concerning the payment of borrowed money. According to Gellius xx. 1, it was ordained in the Twelve Tables, that if the debtor admitted the debt, or had been condemned in the amount of the debt by a judge, he had thirty days allowed him for payment. At the expiration of this time, he was liable to be assigned over to the creditor (addictus) by the sentence of the prætor. The creditor was required to keep him for sixty days in chains, during which time he publicly exposed the debtor on three nundinae, and proclaimed the amount of his debt. If no person released the prisoner by paying the debt, the creditor might sell him as a slave, or put him to death. If there were several creditors, the letter of the law allowed them to cut the debtor in pieces, and to take their share of his body in proportion to their debt. Although, as Gellius says, there was no instance of a creditor having adopted this extreme mode of satisfying his debt, that permission, and the possibility of acting so, show the barbarous character of that law. It was only by the Lex Poetelia (B.C. 326) that the condition of the nexi was alleviated (compare *Heinecc.*, Antiq. Jur. Rom. III. xxx. 2; *Hefter*, Athen. Gerichtsverfahren, p. 455, *et seq.*; *Smith*, Dict. of Antiq. p. 796—798).

To take interest for money borrowed by the poor was entirely forbidden by the Hebrew lawgiver; because it would have been a hardship for them, and would in most cases have defeated the object of the loan, which aimed at assisting them in regaining their former independence. But it is usually asserted, that it was

הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ תְּשִׁיבֶנּוּ לוֹ׃ 26 כִּי הִוא כְסוּתֹה לְבַדָּהּ הִוא שִׂמְלָתוֹ

ס כסותו ק׳

equally unlawful to take interest from the rich, because Moses did, in general, not wish to encourage commerce, but intended to accustom the people exclusively to agriculture; and rich persons will, ordinarily, borrow money only for the purpose of mercantile speculations, which would have tended to alienate them from the pursuits of agriculture, and ultimately to endanger the equality of the citizens. It is added, that it would have been difficult to fix, who was opulent enough to pay interest; and that the permission of taking per centage would inevitably have turned out to the disadvantage of the poor, to whom nobody would easily have granted loans, if there was the possibility of investing the money more safely and more advantageously in the hands of the rich. However, neither the letter nor the spirit of our law justify such interpretation: 1. In our passage we read distinctly: "If thou lendest money to any of my people that is poor (את עמי את העני, see *infra*).... thou shalt not lay upon him interest"; and still more clearly in Lev. xxv. 35—37: "And if thy brother become poor and be reduced to poverty with thee, then thou shalt relieve him; take thou no interest of him, or increase; but fear thy God, that thy brother may live with thee." These words are too clear to be mistaken; the loans of which those passages treat are loans of charity; the prohibition against taking interest stands here in the midst of a cycle of laws enacted in favour of the needy, the orphan, the widow, and the stranger; it is addressed more to the feeling than the understanding; and is coupled with the law of pledges, which concludes with the most pathetic and affecting appeal to the heart. The circumstance, that in Deut. xxiii. 20, the law is expressed with the general terms: "Thou shalt not lend upon interest to thy brother," has little influence upon the bearings of the case, since Deuteronomy contains merely a sketch of the laws formerly given in greater detail; we must frequently illustrate the fifth book from the three preceding ones; a contradiction between both is impossible; but deviations *in the form* are even found in the decalogue, the kernel and most sacred part of the whole legislation. 2. Although commerce was not encouraged by Moses, he could not systematically exclude it: and if he feared dangerous consequences from foreign trade, he could have no objection to a home commerce, which was indispensable in a great and flourishing state, the comforts of which inclined, in some periods, to luxury. We see, in fact, commerce not only carried on in the time of Solomon, but before and after his reign. 3. As this law belongs to the class of charitable provisions, it must be left to the conscience and feeling of every body to decide, who is in want of a loan without interest, and who not; in such precepts of benevolence rigid injunctions are impossible; it is the very nature of charity and brotherly love, to disregard external advantage, and merely to seek internal satisfaction; it was, therefore, not to be feared, that if it was allowed to take interest from the rich, nobody would lend to the poor; just as little as we apprehend at present, that because every capitalist can lucratively invest his money, charity will cease to exist among us. Those laws, which are given for the heart, and the reward and punishment for which are withdrawn from the earthly judge and assigned to the Eternal, must necessarily leave some scope to feeling; charity would, indeed, lose its grace and its beatifying charm, if it were encompassed in strict and compulsory regulations. Moses could, therefore, not forbid a reasonable per centage controlled by the state, for loans advanced to persons in prosperous circumstances, who might momentarily require it for a thousand possible emergencies.

It was also lawful to take interests from

sun-set. 26. For that *is* his covering only; it *is* his raiment for his skin: wherein shall he sleep? And it shall

foreigners (Deut. xxiii. 21), because with regard to these, the reason above stated did not exist. If an Israelite possessed superfluous capital, he could reasonably demand some compensation from a member of a foreign state for the risk incurred by him; and if the foreigner applied that capital to commercial undertakings, no Mosaic principle was in the least endangered. Moreover, the right of reciprocity prevailed in these laws. For it was supposed that foreign nations also would not lend to Israelites without interest: the Israelites, therefore, on their part, were not prohibited taking from them some indemnification for the use of their money. From the same principle of reciprocity, the Hebrews were permitted to insist in the Sabbath-year upon the payment of debts due to them by non-Israelites, because it was to be expected that the latter also, who were not bound by the Mosaic precepts, would not hesitate to exact debts from the Hebrews (Deut. xxiii. 21; compare *Michaelis*, Mos. R. § 152—155; *Fassel*, Civil Recht, p. 22). The Pentateuch offers us no clue to decide what the usual per centage was; in Nehemiah v. 11, the hundredth part (centesima) is mentioned; but it is not clear, whether this was the annual or the monthly interest (as among the Romans).

Besides the *interest* (נשך), the law interdicts the תרבית or מרבית (Lev. xxv. 36, 37); namely, if a person lends to another fruits or corn or other natural products, he is not allowed to demand in return a greater quantity than he has lent him. According to others מרבית is an increase at the repayment of capital, for which the creditor has received no interest, which would, in fact, only be another form of usury (see *Mishna*, Bab. Mez. v. 1; *Gesen.*, Thes. p. 1257).—It is, therefore, not surprising that *usury* is in the Old Testament branded with the utmost contempt and ignominy; even the word נשך *interest*, is traced back to נשך, *to bite like a serpent*, and thus obtained in the minds of the people a hateful and abominated notion (see *Rashi* on ver. 23; compare Prov. xxviii. 8; Ezek. xviii. 8, 13, 17; xxii. 12; Jer. xv. 10; Job. xxii. 6; xxiv. 3, etc.). It is, indeed, undeniable that the sacred legislator, and all the other inspired writers, exhausted the whole power of human language to effect a radical extirpation of that vice; and if the fundamental conditions of a pious and virtuous life are enumerated, abstinence from interest is seldom omitted (Ps. xv. 5, etc.), as on the other hand, the most awful curses of heaven are called down upon the heartless usurer (Job xxiv. 9, 20, etc.). The legal punishment set on usury is not stated in the Old Testament; but besides the restitution of the unjust gain, the universal, public defamation was a punishment more tormenting than either fines or imprisonment.—The wording of our verse seems to intimate, that feneration was, in the time of Moses, a common vice among the nations with which the Israelites came into contact: "thou shalt not be to him כנשה, that is, like the usual creditors" (for נשה is merely *to lend*), or, "thou shalt take no interest" (נשך, see *supra*, Onk. חבוליא, wound, bite; but נשך signifies merely *interest*, not *usury*, as Luther, the English Version, and many others translate, thereby bringing confusion into these laws). As the prohibition to take no interest applies only to Israelites, not to foreigners, our text uses the phrase את עמי את העני. The Talmud (Bab. Mez. 114) finds herein an allusion, that on lending out money the Israelite is to have precedence before the foreigner. Ebn Ezra understands the expression העני metaphorically, as the *pious*, for, says he, the pious seek no riches in this world. We need not to remark, that although עני and ענו express originally kindred notions (see p. 333), our text treats of the poor in general. Nor do those words contain an intimation,

לְעֹרוֹ בַּמֶּה יִשְׁכָּב וְהָיָה כִּי־יִצְעַק אֵלַי וְשָׁמַעְתִּי כִּי־חַנּוּן
אָנִי ס רביעי 27 אֱלֹהִים לֹא תְקַלֵּל
וְנָשִׂיא בְעַמְּךָ לֹא תָאֹר׃ 28 מְלֵאָתְךָ וְדִמְעֲךָ לֹא תְאַחֵר בְּכוֹר

that the majority, or the bulk of the people, consisted of poor persons; for no legislation has taken greater care to prevent pauperism than that of Moses; although naturally, in the course of time, manifold inequalities of property could not fail to arise. For those who seek the prototypes of the Mosaic laws in the Egyptian institutions, we add the following passage from Diodorus Siculus (i. 79): "According to the Egyptian law, it was forbidden to allow the interest to increase to more than *double* the original sum. But the creditor was not permitted to seize the debtor's person, whilst it was lawful to take his property for the debt."

25. About the Right of Pledges. Vers. 25, 26.

Moses permitted the creditor, as a security for his loans, to take pledges, but under the following salutary and humane restrictions: 1. If the pledge was the raiment of the *poor* debtor, the creditor was bound to return it to him in the evening, for the great, long garment served in the day as a dress, and in the night as a cover (see on ver. 26; Deut. xxiv. 12); and he, who refuses to comply with this command, calls upon himself the special vengeance of the compassionate God (ver. 26; Deut. xxiv. 13; Ezek. xviii. 12). 2. The hand-mill and the mill-stones were not permitted to be taken at all as pledges (Deut. xxiv. 6), because they were indispensable for the preparation of the flour and bread, that is, the most necessary articles of subsistence. After the same analogy, all similar utensils were likewise prohibited to be taken as pledges, as the implements of agriculture, or the animals necessary for its cultivation (Job xxii. 6. See *Maimon.*, Hilch. Malveh iii. 2: "Everything is forbidden to be taken, which is used for preparing food"). 3. The creditor shall not himself enter into the house of the debtor, but wait before the door, till the latter delivers up to him the pledge, evidently from fear, lest the former, tempted by personal inspection, take a more valuable or an indispensable object (Deut. xxiv. 10, 11). —According to the whole agrarian constitution of Moses, the sales of territorial estates were virtually nothing but mortgages, or transfers of the produce of the soil, since the fields, which, as in the legislation of Lycurgus, were inalienable property of the family (Lev. xxv.), in the year of jubilee, fell back to the proprietors without indemnification. About the pledges connected with promises (ערבון) see Genesis xxxviii. 17, *et seq.*; about hostages (בני תערבות), 2 Kings xiv. 14. Compare, in general, *Maimon.*, Hilch. Malveh; *Mich.*, Mos. Right ii. § 150, 151 Jewish tradition has, in perfect harmony with the spirit of the Mosaic laws, added a great number of excellent precepts, entirely framed in the interest of the poor and distressed, and intended to protect them from shame and degradation.

25. The masculine suffix in תשיבנו refers irregularly to the feminine שלמה; see note on i. 21.

26. Over the tunic the Bedouins in Asia and North-Africa wear a blanket, called *haik*, (i.e., cover), which resembles perfectly the plaid of the Scotch Highlanders. These haiks are of different sizes, and of different quality and fineness. They are commonly six yards long, and five or six feet broad; serving the Kabyle and Arab for a complete dress in the day; and as they sleep in raiment, like the Israelites of old, it serves likewise for their bed and covering by night. It is a loose, but troublesome garment, frequently discomposed, and falling upon the ground, so that the person who wears it, is every moment obliged to tuck it up, and fold it anew about the body (see *Paxton*, Illustr. i.

come to pass, when he crieth to me, that I will hear *him*; for I *am* compassionate.—27. Thou shalt not revile [1]God, nor curse [2]a magistrate of thy people.—28. Thou shalt

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—The gods. [2] The ruler.

p. 287; *Rosenm.*, Orient ii. p. 79; *De Wette*, Arch. p. 159).—כסותה instead of כְּסוּתוֹ; see ver. 4, ad בעירה.— About בַּמֶּה see *Ges.*, Gr. § 37.

26. Disrespect towards God and the Authorities. Ver. 27.

The decalogue already contains a solemn interdiction against abusing the holy name for purposes of falsehood; it is, therefore, natural that disrespect, especially if it manifested itself in cursing the deity was visited with the severest punishments. In Leviticus xxiv. 15, 16, this law is more distinctly thus expressed: "And thou shalt speak to the children of Israel, saying, Whosoever curseth his God shall bear his sin. And he who blasphemeth the name of the Lord, he shall surely be put to death; all the congregation shall certainly stone him: as well the stranger as he who is born in the land, when he blasphemeth the name of the Lord, shall be put to death" (compare vers. 10—12). This violation of the reverence due to God is, in a theocratical state, the only possible form of the crimes *læsae majestatis* and of high-treason; it undermines the foundation of the political edifice; and the whole community was, therefore, interested in punishing such transgressions. About the connection of this law with the preceding precepts, Philippson remarks: "The last verses treat of the poor. God is the providence by which the destinies of men are dispensed. The poor is warned, even in desperate and difficult situations not to revolt against God's providence by blasphemous words. As אלהים signifies here the predestination of God, so נשיא implies His law and its decision."

As the נשיא or chief magistrate exercises the executive power in the name and by the laws of God, reverence towards him is, in a religious and political point of view, equally indispensable, and the combination of these two laws, concerning God and the magistrates, is thus easily explicable. But some expositors have taken אלהים here in the signification of *judges*, as in xxi. 6; thus Ebn Ezra, Rashbam, Rosenmüller, and others. But the judges are implied in the following term, נשיא; and אלהים alone, in the meaning of judges, is used in passages only where judicial proceedings are clearly treated of, not in an abrupt command, as in our verse. Still less appropriate is the conception of אלהים as strange gods or idols, as Josephus (Antiq. IV. viii. 10; Contr. Ap. 33) and Philo (De Vita Mos. ii. p. 166; De Monarch. ii. p. 212, ed. Mang.) assert, observing, that Moses wished to prevent the heathens from abusing, in a similar manner, the name of the God of Israel from motives of retaliation. It has, however, been correctly remarked by Michaelis (Mos. Right v. § 251), that this interpretation was shrewdly advanced by Josephus in order to convince the Romans, that even their deities were treated by the Israelites with a certain respect; whilst such apologetical considerations could not possibly influence a legislator who framed his laws, not for a *subjugated*, but for a *governing* people. Moreover, that interpretation would not agree with the words of the text: "Whoever curseth his God" (אלהיו); since the strange gods would not be the gods of the *Israelites*. And yet, even Mendelsohn translates: "Ein goetlliches Wesen sollst du nicht schelten." The Koran prescribes, that "the person who utters blasphemy against God, or Mohammed, or Christ, or Moses, or any prophet, is to be put to death without delay, even though he profess himself repentant; repentance for such a sin being deemed impossible." Thus blasphemy is considered a more heinous sin than apostacy.

בָּנֶיךָ תִּתֶּן־לִי׃ 29 כֵּן־תַּעֲשֶׂה לְשֹׁרְךָ לְצֹאנֶךָ שִׁבְעַת יָמִים יִהְיֶה

27. About the Offering of the First Fruits. Vers. 28, 29, and XXIII. 19 (First Part).

The law concerning the *firstlings* is here but briefly alluded to, and is, in later passages, more fully treated (Lev. xix. 23—25; Num. xv. 20, 21; xviii. 12, 13; Deut. xviii. 4; xxvi. 2—11; compare Nehem. x. 36—38). To God belonged the firstlings of corn, of tree-fruits, and of grapes; further, the first wine, oil, flour, and dough, even the first wool of the sheep (ראשית גז). The priests, as God's servants, received these gifts, since they had no territorial property of their own. A measure of the firstlings is not fixed in the Pentateuch; the Talmud takes one-sixtieth part of the produce as the minimum, but recommends one-thirtieth. Jewish tradition demands, however, the firstlings only of the seven chief productions of Palestine: "wheat, barley, vine, figs, pomegranates, olives, and honey" (Deut. viii. 8). The Talmud distinguishes further between ראשית, the actual produce of the soil, as corn, fruits, etc., and תרמה, preparations of new produce, as oil, flour, wine, etc., and ordained, that this latter class of firstlings should not be brought into the temple, but should be given to the nearest priest; on the other hand, they were to be presented even from the produce of Jewish fields in *foreign* countries, whilst the ראשית were only offered from the firstlings of the soil of Palestine. In Deut. xxvi. 2—11, the mode of offering the firstlings is described. They were laid in a basket and brought into the temple to the high-priest, who places the basket before the altar; then the boundless mercy which God has shown to the Israelites since their immigration into Egypt is briefly but emphatically alluded to.

Thou shalt not tarry to offer to God מלאתך ודמעך.—מלאה, *fulness, abundance*, namely, of corn, of which abundant harvests were promised to the Israelites. Septuagint: ἀπαρχὰς ἅλωνος.—דמע, tear, metaphorically used of the juice of olives and grapes, *i.e.* of wine and must. Septuagint: ἀπαρχὰς ληνοῦ, firstlings of the press. Kimchi: "that which comes out of the press in drops like tears." The same metaphor is used in Greek (δάκρυον τῶν δένδρων, Theoph.); Latin ("arborum lacrimæ," Plin.); and in French ("le pleurement de la vigne"). Rashi understands מלאה as the firstlings (בכורים; and so Onkelos); and דמע as the תרומה; Ebn Ezra believes the former to apply to must, the latter, to oil. But these are only personal conjectures. We must take מלאה and דמע as nearly synonymous, signifying, figuratively, the *choicest* and *best* fruits; although מלאה may apply more particularly to corn, and דמע to wine.—About the sanctification of the first-born of men and beasts, see note on xiii. 2. Compare Num. xviii. 15—18.—It is well known, that similar offerings of the first and best fruits to the gods were common to nearly all the nations of antiquity, as a natural manner of divine veneration; so they were in use among the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, Hyperboreans, and others. See *Rosenm.* Orient. p. 80—82; *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. i. p. 344; where a copious list of references is given.—The first-fruits of all newly-planted trees belonged also to God; but, as the fruits are generally in the first few years very imperfect and tasteless, they were not to be used at all; the produce of the fourth year belonged to God; and from the fifth year only the proprietor had the fruition (Lev. xix. 23—25).—*On the eighth day thou shalt give it me.* "Lambs became pure on the eighth day, calves on the twentieth, after their birth" (*Plin.* Hist. Nat. 8).

28. About Unlawful Meat. Ver. 30.

As in the brief outline of the fundamental laws contained in chapters xxi to xxiii. no important precept could be omitted, a principal injunction regarding

not delay *to offer* [1]from the abundance of thy *corn* and the choicest of thy *wine;* the firstborn of thy sons shalt thou give to me. 29. The same shalt thou do with thy oxen, *and* with thy sheep: seven days it shall be with its

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—The first of thy ripe fruits and of thy liquors.

the dietary laws is, with a few words, incorporated in this code. A great number of these commands proceed from the simple maxim, that the blood is the soul of the animal, and that it must, from this reason, not be eaten (נפש הבשר בדם הִיא, Lev. xvii. 11, 14; or הדם הוא הנפש, Deut. xii. 23). If, therefore, a beast is found dead, it may well be supposed that it was "suffocated in its blood" (πνικτόν), and that it did not expire in a normal way. This is נבלה, or, according to Josephus (Antiq. III. xi. 2), the flesh "of an animal that died of itself" (τοῦ τεθνηκότος αὐτομάτως ζώου); and this is entirely interdicted to the Israelites. Although such animal might, in most cases, be unwholesome, and the use of its flesh be deemed injurious, it could yet not be forbidden to strangers and foreigners, as they were, in this case, not actuated by any *religious*, but merely by a *sanitary*, consideration, and they will certainly have spontaneously abstained from such flesh in all doubtful cases (see Deut. xiv. 21). But there was another sort of unlawful meat, which is mentioned in our verse, טרפה, namely, if an animal was torn by a wild beast, a jackal, a fox, a wolf, or a rabid dog, the use of its flesh is naturally and evidently injurious for *all*, and is therefore forbidden to all without exception: "it shall be thrown before the dogs." (See also *Maimon.*, Mor. Neb. iii. 48). But if, nevertheless, a man eats of נבלה or טרפה, "whether he be a proselyte or a native Hebrew, he shall wash his clothes, bathe himself, and be unclean until the evening" (Lev. xvii. 15). These words imply, besides, the intimation, that the laws concerning נבלה and טרפה have also a reference to the *purity* and *sanctity* of Israel, individually and nationally; since the nature of food has commonly no inconsiderable influence upon the refinement and the manners of a people; and that those laws have this spiritual basis is obvious, both from our passage and from Deut. iv. 21 ("and you shall be holy men to me;" "for a holy nation thou art to the Lord thy God;" see also Lev. xi. 43, 44; compare on these expressions note to xix. 6). What is torn is forbidden, wherever it be found; but our verse mentions the usual case, if the animal was torn in the *field.* The Koran (v. 4) has borrowed these precepts from the Mosaic law: "You are forbidden to eat that which has died of itself [נבלה], and the blood (and pork, and that at the killing of which the name of another deity except God has been invoked), and that which was suffocated, and that which was killed by strokes or by a fall, or by the horns of another animal, and that which was torn by wild beasts [טרפה], except if you have first killed it entirely" [that is, if it was still alive when it came into your hands, and was then killed by you in the lawful manner]. Compare ii. 175; xvi. 115; and Niebuhr (Descr. of Ar. p. 178, 179) remarks: "The general rule of the Mohammedans is, according to the opinion of the doctors of Bassora, not to eat any animal which attacks men, or which tears human bodies. They are further forbidden to eat an animal which was torn by another animal. If, for instance, a dog has only tasted the blood of game, it is not interdicted (halâl); but if he has eaten some portion of the flesh also, it is forbidden (herâm).... The Mohammedans are, in general, not permitted to eat an animal, the death of which was not accompanied with the shedding of blood," obviously, because then the soul was believed to be still in the animal; as the Rabbins also call the blood the

עִם־אִמּוֹ בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁמִינִי תִּתְּנוֹ־לִי׃ 30 וְאַנְשֵׁי־קֹדֶשׁ תִּהְיוּן לִי וּבָשָׂר
בַּשָּׂדֶה טְרֵפָה לֹא תֹאכֵלוּ לַכֶּלֶב תַּשְׁלִכוּן אֹתוֹ׃ ס

"essence of the sacrifice" (עקר הקרבן), and propose the principle: "There is no atonement, except by the *blood* of the sacrifice" (אין כפרה אלא בדם). Even in the ancient Greek writers we find similar precepts to that enjoined in our

כג 1 לֹא תִשָּׂא שֵׁמַע שָׁוְא אַל־תָּשֶׁת יָדְךָ עִם־רָשָׁע לִהְיֹת עֵד
חָמָס׃ 2 לֹא־תִהְיֶה אַחֲרֵי־רַבִּים לְרָעֹת וְלֹא־תַעֲנֶה עַל־רִב לִנְטֹת

CHAPTER XXIII.

29. About Judicial Justice. Vers. 1—3, 6—8.

The condensed code of the Law, which is concluded in this chapter, naturally carries out the consequences of the Ten Commandments; and, after murder has been treated in xxi. 12—14, theft in xxi. 37, *et seq.*, the ninth commandment is now further developed: not to bear false witness against our neighbour. From this principle follows, neither to join the wicked to confirm a false evidence, nor, in pronouncing judgment, to follow the blind indiscriminating multitude to the detriment of justice, nor even to favour the poor in the courts of the law from ill-placed pity. Originally the chiefs and elders of the tribes and families were, no doubt, the judges between contending tribes or quarrelling members of the same tribe (Deut. i. 16); the local tribunals (xvi. 18) were most likely also presided over by the elders of the respective towns. In difficult cases, the decision was referred to the priests and Levites at the temple (Deut. xvii. 8, etc.). In the time of the judges, these exercised the right of jurisdiction; a regular administration of justice seems first to have been introduced by Samuel (1 Sam. vii. 16, 18, *et seq.*). Already in the times of David and Solomon, local courts existed (1 Chron. xxiii. 4); the kings formed the highest tribunals of appeal; but they were, besides, accessible to every subject, whatever case he might wish to submit to them (2 Sam. xiv. 4; xv. 2, *et seq.*). The jurisdiction was public—mostly at the gates of the towns—oral and summary (Deut. xxi. 19; xxv. 1). For a legal evidence, two witnesses were at least required (Deut. xix. 15; Num. xxv. 30). If more than one judge formed the tribunal, the opinion of the majority prevailed (Deut. xix. 12; *infra*, ver. 2). The sentence was executed immediately, before the eyes of the judge (Deut. xxxv. 2; Josh. vii. 19—25, *et seq.*). Every Israelite was eligible as judge, whose intelligence commanded respect, and whose integrity inspired confidence (xviii. 21); the principle of democratic equality pervaded that institution also, and not the Levites alone were admissible to judicial functions, as has been erroneously asserted. The importance and sacredness of these duties are frequently and impressively enjoined (Deut. i. 16, 17; xiii. 15; xvi. 19, 20). Maimonides (Sanh. ii. 7) enumerates seven necessary qualities of a judge: wisdom, humility, fear of God, aversion to avarice, love of truth, popularity, and unblemished reputation. The Hebrew judges were, therefore, held in the highest respect; they are considered as representatives of God; and it was deemed highly criminal to abuse them by deed or language (xxi. 6; xxii. 27).

1. As this verse seems to speak of the *witness*, the words לא תשא שמע שוא are to be taken: "thou shalt not *raise* or *pronounce* a false report;" that is, thou shalt, as a witness, not bring forward any evidence, the truth of which is not

mother, on the eighth day thou shalt give it me.—30. And you shall be holy men to me: neither shall you eat *any* flesh *that is* torn *of beasts* in the field; you shall cast it to the dogs.

verse (see *Diog. Laert.* viii. 33; *Rosenm.* Orient. ii. p. 82—84); and analogous principles are adhered to in the customary right of all civilized nations.

Chap. XXIII. 1. Thou shalt not raise a false report: put not thy hand with the wicked to be [1]a witness for violence. 2. Thou shalt not follow the many to evil, neither shalt thou speak in a cause to deviate after the

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—An unrighteous witness.

clearly known to thee, or of the falsehood of which thou art convinced. The verb נשא, in the same meaning, is used in xx. 7. Thus explains Ebn Ezra: "thou shalt not let go forth from thy heart an untruth to propagate a calumny." But Targum Onkelos and Jonathan, the Septuagint, Vulgate, Rashi, Luther, Zunz, and others, understand these words to mean: "thou shalt not *take up* or credit a false report" (לא תקביל, οὐ παραδέξῃ, non suscipies). But this would, of course, refer to the *judge*, and would therefore scarcely agree with the second part of the verse, which speaks of the duties of a *witness*.—רשע signifies here, as in ii. 13, the guilty; and he who joins him against the innocent would be עד חמס, "a witness of oppression." The efficient punishment fixed by Moses for the calumniator and false witness, was, that they suffered themselves that very injury which they contemplated to bring over their intended victims—a very wise and just extension of the right of retaliation (Deut. xix. 16—21).

2. Even if thou hearest many pronounce an unjust opinion in a lawsuit, thou shalt not follow them in this injustice (לא תהיה אחרי רבים לרעת); in such case, therefore, thou shalt not lean towards the multitude, to violate the right or to pervert justice (ולא תענה על־רב לנטת אחרי רבים להטת). This is the simple sense of our verse, which has, however, been misunderstood by the traditional interpretation; for the words אחרי רבים להטת were taken together and explained: "that we must follow the opinion of the majority"; which would, however, on the one hand, absolutely contradict the first part of the verse: "thou shalt not follow the many to evil," and would, on the other hand, in *moral* questions, be a very doubtful precept, however commendable it is in abstract questions of the law, and in civil and social government. Moreover, the distinctive accent beneath רבים (Tipchah), proves that, even in the opinion of the Masorites, this word is not connected with the succeeding להטת; and Rashi and Rashbam supply, after להטת, the accusative משפט, and the Septuagint, κρίσιν. נטה, intransitive, *to incline*; in Hiphil, הטה, causative, *to bend, pervert;* sometimes used with משפט following, as in Deut. xxvii. 19 (מטה משפט), sometimes without it, as in Malachi iii. 5 (ומטי גר). Some take רבים, as great, mighty people, as Job xxxv. 10, etc. But the context, especially the succeeding words (אחרי רבים להטת) show that it is to be accepted in its usual signification.

3. The legislator has proved by a series of excellent precepts, how deeply he felt for the distress of the poor, and has provided for them with unexampled humanity and truly paternal affection (see notes on xxii. 20—26). But just for

אַחֲרֵי רַבִּים לְהַטֹּת׃ 3 וְדָל לֹא תֶהְדַּר בְּרִיבוֹ׃ ס 4 כִּי
תִפְגַּע שׁוֹר אֹיִבְךָ אוֹ חֲמֹרוֹ תֹּעֶה הָשֵׁב תְּשִׁיבֶנּוּ לוֹ׃ ס 5 כִּי־
תִרְאֶה חֲמוֹר שֹׂנַאֲךָ רֹבֵץ תַּחַת מַשָּׂאוֹ וְחָדַלְתָּ מֵעֲזֹב לוֹ עָזֹב תַּעֲזֹב

this reason he deemed it necessary to enjoin, not to privilege them from misunderstood compassion: for strict justice is the chief and the strongest pillar of every social edifice; and inasmuch as the humble position of the poor ought not to prejudice him in the eyes of the judge (ver. 6), even so should it not be an advantage or a recommendation: "Thou shalt not respect the person of the poor nor honour the person of the mighty; in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbour," see ver. 8.—הדר, to decorate, adorn, honour. Onkelos, freely, לא תרחם: "thou shalt not have pity."

30. About found Property. Ver. 4.

The law contained in this verse is expressed more clearly and fully in Deut. xxii. 1—3: "Thou shalt not see thy brother's ox, or his sheep go astray, and hide thyself from them: thou shalt in any case bring them again to thy brother. And if thy brother is not nigh to thee, or if thou dost not know him, then thou shalt bring it to thy house, and it shall be with thee until thy brother seek after it, and thou shalt restore it to him again. In like manner, shalt thou do with his ass; and so shalt thou do with his raiment, and with all lost things of thy brother's which he hath lost, and thou hast found, shalt thou do likewise: thou mayest not hide thyself." But if the proprietor is only discovered some time afterwards, and if he died in the meantime, his relatives receive the property; if he has no relatives it is handed over to the priests (Numb. v. 8). But if the finder has attempted to keep it for himself, he must restore it together with the fifth part of its value, and sacrifice a ram as a guilt-offering (Deut. v. 6, 7). If a person is suspected to have fraudulently kept found property, an oath is administered to him; and if he is guilty of a false oath, he has —besides the usual infamy attending perjury—to restore, in addition, the fifth part of the value, and to sacrifice a guilt-offering, that God may pardon his transgression (Levit. v. 20—26). In this, and in the following verse, the *enemy* is treated of, as the animosity against him may tempt a man to injustice; and all obligations of love, due to an enemy, must, as a matter of course, be extended to all our fellow-men. And even the thoroughly orthodox protestant divine, Gerlach, writes: "In these laws, genuine, active love for an enemy, is inculcated; they prove how unjust it is unconditionally to ascribe to the Old Testament the sentence in Matt. v. 43: 'You have heard that it has been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, but hate thine enemy.'"—We take אויב and שנא as synonymous, although one might be an *adversary* of another without *hating* him, as, for instance, in political contentions.

31. Humanity towards Animals. Ver. 5.

The truly humane and wise precept of this verse is, in itself, sufficiently clear, but it gains additional light by the parallel passage in Deut. xxii. 4: "Thou shalt not see thy brother's ass or his ox fall down by the way and hide thyself from them: thou shalt surely help him to lift them up again" (לא תראה את חמור אחיך או שורו נפלים בדרך והתעלמת מהם הקם תקים עמו). But, however unquestionable this *sense* is, the *words* of our verse are extremely disputed. The simplest and clearest interpretation is the following: "If thou seest the ass of thy enemy lying under his burden, forbear (וחדלת) to leave it (the burden) to him (the ass); thou shalt leave it (or the place) only with him (the master)." חדל,

many to pervert *justice*. 3. Nor shalt thou countenance a poor man in his cause.—4. If thou meet thy enemy's ox or his ass erring about, thou shalt surely bring it back to him.—5. If thou seest the ass of him that hateth thee lying under its burden, [1]forbear to leave *it* to it; thou

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—And wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help with him.

in the signification of abstaining, forbearing, occurs also in 2 Chron. xxxv. 21; Jer. xli. 8. The words וחדלת מעזב לו, in our verse, are parallel with והתעלמת מהם, "and thou shalt *not* hide thyself from them (the animals)." But from this correspondence it does not necessarily follow, that we must take וחדלת מעזב לו also to the first part of the clause. It is, further, not exactly necessary to understand the verb עזב, in the second and third part of our verse, quite identically; the prepositions לו and עמו with which it is connected, cause necessarily a difference of the signification, such as we have expressed in the translation: "Only if the master himself despairs to help up the animal, or after he has succeeded to effect this with thy assistance, thou shalt leave the animal or the place with the master."—But various are the expositions of the ancient interpreters; Targum Onkelos renders: "If thou see .... thou shalt cease to forsake him; thou shalt abandon that which is in thy heart against him, and shalt rescue (the animal) with him." But this conception of עזב תעזב עמו, is perfectly unfounded.—Ebn Ezra explains: "forbear to leave the matter to him alone, but thou shalt loosen the bands and release the animal with him." But although עזב can perhaps be used in the sense of *freeing* (for instance, in the phrase עצור ועזוב, slave and free man, Deut. xxxii. 36), it is very questionable in this instance, as עזב is immediately before applied in its usual very different signification of *leaving* or *abandoning*.—Still more hazardous appears Rashi's exposition, who takes עזב here in the meaning of עזר, *to help* (and this is adopted by the English Version, and Luzzato), and understands the words וחדלת וכ׳ as an interrogation: "Wilt thou withdraw thyself from helping him? help rather the animal with him." But it must be urged that the instances adduced to prove the signification of עזב (1 Kings xiv. 10; Nehem. iii. 9, etc.) are not conclusive.—Geddes, following this translation of Rashi, seriously proposes to read in our verse three times עזר instead of עזב. Rashbam takes, with as little plausibility, עזב in the sense of *strengthening, supporting* (לשון חזוק).—Luther translates, very strangely: "hüte dich, lass ihn nicht, sondern versäume gern das Deine um seinetwillen." When does עזב mean, to neglect one's business, and עם, for the sake of?—Michaelis deviates from the explanation adopted by us only in the acceptation of the preposition לו, which he refers to *the master*, not to the animal, and translates accordingly: "Siehst du den Esel deines Feindes unter der Last erliegen, so sollst du nicht vorbeigehen, und ihn seinem Herrn hülflos überlassen, sondern du sollst angreifen, und ihn nicht eher als der Eigenthümer selbst verlassen."—Mendelssohn unites the significations of helping and freeing in עזב, and translates: "help him rather to unpack," which is no doubt arbitrary.—Rosenmüller, who follows the interpretation of Sypkens, understands חדל in the meaning of "socium destituit auxilio," and עזב in the sense of "laxare, relaxare" (Job x. 1), and taking וחדלת to the protasis, he translates: "Quando videris osoris tui asinum succumbentem sub onere suo, et volueris eum auxilio destituere, quominus vincula ei relaxes, relaxando relaxabis cum eo (osore tuo)." But, on the one hand, those significations of חדל and עזר are very uncertain (עזר is, in such instances, followed by an objective

עִמּֽוֹ׃ ס חמישי 6 לֹא תַטֶּה מִשְׁפַּט
אֶבְיֹנְךָ בְּרִיבֽוֹ׃ 7 מִדְּבַר־שֶׁקֶר תִּרְחָק וְנָקִי וְצַדִּיק אַל־תַּהֲרֹג כִּי
לֹא־אַצְדִּיק רָשָֽׁע׃ 8 וְשֹׁחַד לֹא תִקָּח כִּי הַשֹּׁחַד יְעַוֵּר פִּקְחִים
וִיסַלֵּף דִּבְרֵי צַדִּיקִֽים׃ 9 וְגֵר לֹא תִלְחָץ וְאַתֶּם יְדַעְתֶּם אֶת־נֶפֶשׁ
הַגֵּר כִּי־גֵרִים הֱיִיתֶם בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָֽיִם׃ 10 וְשֵׁשׁ שָׁנִים תִּזְרַע אֶת־

case), and, on the other hand, the whole construction is heavy and obscure, as, after *relaxes*, we must supply: "cave ne ejusmodi criminis fias reus." Similarly, however, explain Gesenius, Zunz, Arnheim, and Glaire. — Cahen translates: "garde-toi de l'abandonner à lui-même, abandonne-toi avec lui," where, accidentally, the Gallicism, "abandonne-toi," coincides with "aide-le."—These are the chief explanations of those who have adhered to the Masoretic text. But some interpreters and translators have altered the text, in order to arrive at a more convenient sense; thus renders the Septuagint: ἀλλὰ συναρεῖς (or συνεγερεῖς) αὐτὸ μετ' αὐτοῦ, "thou shalt raise it (the animal) up with him (the master)," evidently after the parallel passage in Deut. xxiv. 4: הקם תקים עמו; and so also the Vulgate: sed sublevabis cum eo, and Saadiah, "thou must relieve him."—Bochart further proposes to read לא instead of לו, so that the sense would be: "forbear to leave him: thou shalt not leave the ass with him (the master)," which, as Gesenius (Thes. p. 1007) justly observes, would be an empty repetition. But even Maurer tries to make that conjecture plausible. To the alteration of עזב into עזר we have already alluded.—If a change of the *vowels* were permitted, we might, perhaps, read: עָזֹב תֵּעָזֵב עִמּוֹ, and the sense would be: "take care not to forsake him, or else thou wilt be forsaken with him or like him." A similar threatening of the same punishment, see xxii. 23.—The law enjoined in our verse was, 1st., *necessary* among an agricultural people, where the loss of a beast of burden might cause the ruin of a citizen; and, 2nd., *practicable*, as every body learnt from his youth how to manage animals, and was therefore well enabled to assist his fellowmen in cases like those to which our verse alludes. The wisdom and humanity of this law is self-evident; it is both advantageous for the prosperity of the community, and considerate for the sufferings of an over-burdened animal, and efficacious in eradicating a blind and destructive hatred among the members of the same commonwealth. Other precepts of compassion towards animals are enjoined in ver. 19; in Lev. xxii. 28; Deut. xxii. 6, 7, 10; and xxv. 4; which will be explained in their due places.

6. See on ver. 3; for דל and אבין are to be taken as synonyms; although the former may be reduced to a more destitute situation than the latter.

7. *From a false cause thou shalt keep aloof*, that is, as a judge thou shalt shun every falsehood, and strictly adhere to truth, and even — as Rabbinical interpreters explain—if thou seest that the court or the witnesses are inclined to injustice, rather resign every connection with them. Compare Lev. xix. 15, 35; Deut. i. 16, 17; xvi. 18—20 (צדק צדק תרדוף); xxiv. 17; xxv. 1—3.—*And the innocent* (נקי) *and righteous* (צדיק) *slay thou not*; strive not to oppress or injure the innocent before thy tribunal; *for I will not justify the wicked*; that is, the judge who pronounces unjust verdicts.—Jewish expositors distinguish between נקי and צדיק, so that נקי is a person, who has been condemned, but has afterwards been defended by another; in such cases the matter shall be examined once more (ונקי אל תהרג); whilst צדיק is he who has been acquitted, but whose guilt somebody later asserts to be able to prove;

shalt leave *it only* with him.—6. Thou shalt not bend the judgment of thy poor in his cause. 7. From a false cause thou shalt keep aloof; and the innocent and righteous slay thou not: for I shall not justify the wicked. 8. And thou shalt take no [1]bribery; for the bribery blindeth the [2]seeing, and perverteth the words of the righteous.—9. And thou shalt not oppress a stranger; for you know the heart of the stranger, since you were strangers in the land of Egypt.—10. And six years thou shalt sow thy

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Gift. [2] Wise.

he shall not be tried again; for, says God, I shall not allow the wicked to remain justified (כי לא אצדיק רשע); even if he escapes human punishment, I shall summon him before my heavenly tribunal (see *Talm.* Sanh. 33, 6). However sagacious, moral, and humane this distinction is, and however it is calculated, in cases of uncertainty, to lead the judge to precaution and leniency, it is scarcely founded in the wording of our text; נקי and צדיק appear to be synonymous, and the last words of our verse must be applied to the unjust judge, not the offender. Onkelos, Mendelssohn, and others, translate: "Do not kill him, who has once been found innocent and just," in which translation it remains indistinct, whether the prohibition is addressed to the judge or to private men.—The Sept. renders: *οὐ δικαιώσεις τὸν ἀσεβῆ ἕνεκα δώρων*, "thou shalt not justify the wicked on account of presents"; here *ἕνεκα δώρων* is added from ver. 8, and instead of אצדיק the reading הַצַּדִּק seems to have been adopted; which the Samaritan Version, in fact, offers. But the Vulgate expresses the sense correctly: "quia aversor impium."

8. As all the laws concerning judges have only been given, in order to secure impartiality of jurisdiction, but as this end is necessarily defeated by the acceptance of any kind of presents or bribes from either party: such practice has been unconditionally and emphatically forbidden, the reason being added, because bribery "maketh blind the seeing (פקחים, from פקח, to open, *scil.*, the eyes) and perverteth (ויסלף from סלף, to pervert, originally, to be slippery; Arab. سلف) the words of the righteous"; even wise and conscientious judges are, from the weakness of human nature, led away from inflexible and uncompromising justice by insinuating presents, and even flattering words, and other marks of personal attention; but the judge, in exercising his functions, must forget his own person, and live entirely for his holy and responsible duties (compare Deut. xvi. 19, 20). It is not the fault of the inspired lawgiver, if later very frequently the loudest and justest complaints against impudent corruptions of the judges were raised (Isaiah i. 23; v. 23; Psalms xxvi. 10; Prov. xvii. 23; xviii. 6, etc.).—A punishment for bribery is not mentioned in the Mosaic law; according to Josephus (Ap. ii. 27) it was considered a capital crime. A corrupt judge deserved, at least, the same punishment as a false witness (Deut. xix. 16—21).

9. About the right of the stranger, see on xxii. 20—26; and about the expressions used in our verse, see ibid. ver. 20. Compare the verse of Virgil: "Non ignara mali miseris succurrere disco" (Æn. i. 630).—The context leads spontaneously to the idea, that in the courts of justice the strangers and the natives are to be treated with perfect equality, which duty is expressly enjoined in Deut. i. 16.

אַרְצֶךָ וְאָסַפְתָּ אֶת־תְּבוּאָתָהּ׃ 11 וְהַשְּׁבִיעִת תִּשְׁמְטֶנָּה וּנְטַשְׁתָּהּ
וְאָכְלוּ אֶבְיֹנֵי עַמֶּךָ וְיִתְרָם תֹּאכַל חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה כֵּן־תַּעֲשֶׂה לְכַרְמְךָ

32. About Sabbath and Sabbath-year. Ver. 10—12.

Although every calm Biblical critic will sedulously keep aloof from mystic speculations on the hidden properties of the numbers, it cannot be denied, that in the sacred volume some numbers predominate, which bear a holy and religious character. Among these the number *seven* ranks first. Its frequent, almost regular repetition, cannot be accidental. The seventh day is the Sabbath, the seventh year the שמטה, or the Sabbath of the fields; after seven times seven years the jubilee, or the perfect restoration of the original conditions of property ensues; the seventh new-moon is the "day of the sound of the trumpet," or "the day of remembrance"; the seventh month is almost entirely occupied with the holiest festivals; Passover lasted seven days, and on every day a sacrifice of seven lambs was offered; seven days was the Feast of Tabernacles, and seven weeks lie between Passover and Pentecost; seven days the young animals remained with their mothers before they were fit for firstling-offerings (Exod. xxii. 29); the circumcision was performed after full seven days from the birth; seven days was the legal duration for many Levitical lustrations; during seven days the priests were initiated; seven times the blood was sprinkled at important expiatory sacrifices; seven days lasted the mourning for the dead (Gen. l. 10); seven days also the marriages (Judg. xiv. 12); seven animals were, in primeval times, presented, on solemn occasions, as alliances and promises (Gen. xxi. 28—30); and the sacred word *oath* (שבועה) is etymologically connected with the number *seven* (שבע); symbolical actions are repeated seven times (1 Kings xviii. 43; 2 Kings v. 10, 14; compare Gen. iv. 15; Eze. xxxix. 9; xl. 22; xli. 3; Num. xxiii. 1, 14, 29; 1 Chron. x. 12, etc.); the mark of the highest reverence was a sevenfold prostration (Gen. xxxiii. 3); and a progeny of seven children was considered a peculiar blessing (1 Sam. ii. 5; Jer. xv. 9; Job i. 2); seven was, in fact, frequently used as a number signifying *many*, in general, or as the number *κατ' ἐξοχήν* (Deut. xxviii. 7; Judg. xv. 7, 17; 2 Kings iv. 35; Psalms cxix. 164; Prov. xxiv. 16; xxvi. 15; Isaiah iv. 1; xi. 15; Job v. 19; Mich. v. 4; Ruth iv. 15). Seven chief utensils were in the holy Tabernacle: 1. the altar of burnt-offerings; 2. the laver; 3. the shew-bread table; 4. the altar of incense; 5. the candelabrum; 6. the ark; and 7. the mercy-seat and the Cherubim, which formed one vessel, xxv. *et seq.* But even in historical events, the number seven is very markedly obvious. Noah took into the ark seven pairs of every clean animal (Gen. vii. 2); seven days before the beginning of the deluge he was once more informed of it (ver. 4); he waited seven days after having first sent out the dove; and when she returned, seven days more (vers. 10, 12); Jacob served seven years for Leah and seven years for Rachel (Gen. xxix. 20, 27, 30); Pharaoh dreamt of seven fat and seven lean cows, of seven full and of seven empty ears of corn; and accordingly, seven years of abundance and seven years of famine ensued (Gen. xl. 1; compare 2 Sam. xxiv. 13; 2 Kings viii. 1); the father-in-law of Moses had seven daughters (Exod. ii. 16), of whom Moses selected the worthiest for his wife; Jericho was encircled during seven days; on the seventh day, seven priests with seven trumpets passed seven times round the city, which was then only attacked and taken (Josh. vi.); Solomon finished the temple in seven years (1 Kings vi. 38); and at its consecration celebrated a festival of twice seven days (viii. 65). It would be easy, by obvious combinations, to increase this list considerably; and we mention only, that the three patriarchs and their four wives make the number seven; but we

land, and shalt gather in the produce thereof: 11. But the seventh *year* thou shalt let it rest and lie still; that the poor of thy people may eat: and what they leave the beasts of the field shall eat. In like manner thou shalt

may distinctly call attention to the fact, that the three "signs of the Covenant" of Mosaism, circumcision, the Passover, and the Sabbath, are all connected with the number seven. The same mystic number prevails especially in the Indian mythology: a God shines through the world on a chariot drawn by seven horses; there are seven worlds (Locas), seven great continents (Dripas), seven oceans; the human body consists of seven chief members; there are seven periods in the life of man, etc.

The simple and obvious explanation of the holiness of the number seven is, that the ancient Israelites, as most of the Eastern nations, counted originally their months after the course of the moon, which renews itself in four quarters of 7⅜ days each, and after this time assumes a new phase. These periodical and extraordinary changes of the moon produced a powerful impression upon the susceptible minds of the ancient nations, they excited them to reflections on this wonderful phenomenon, and everything connected with it, assumed, in their eyes, a peculiar significance. Hence the day of the new-moon was generally celebrated with some distinguishing solemnity, which, like all festivals, is regulated and fixed in the Mosaic law (Num. x. 10; xxviii. 11, etc.); and the new moon is in the Old Testament frequently mentioned together with the Sabbath (2 Kings iv. 23; Isaiah i. 13, etc.). Hereto we add, that the number of the seven planets known to them (Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the Sun, Venus, Mercury, the Moon), which successively presided over the hours of the day, and each of which commenced therefore a different day, contributed in later times not a little to secure to it that mysterious significance; especially as the result of the astrological pursuits soon brought all human affairs and occupations into some relation with those planets. But that division of the week into seven days was known and adopted by the most different nations, as the Assyrians, Arabs, Indians, Chinese, Peruvians (but not the Persians), and many African and American tribes, which never came into intercourse with the Israelites, and later by the Greeks and Romans, who followed the Egyptians. We must, therefore, recognise therein, not an exclusively theocratical, but a general astronomical arrangement, which offered itself to the simplest planetary observation of every people. Hence we reject the very artificial theories of Baehr (Symbol. i. 187; ii. 588), Kurtz, and others, that seven is composed of three (the character of the divine) and four (the character of the Kosmos), and that it therefore signifies the combination of God and the world. However, the historical and other applications of the number seven above introduced, prove unmistakeably that the Israelites attached to it a peculiar sanctity and meaning; that it was considered as the number of combination and connection, of unity and harmony, of salvation and blessing, of peace and sanctification; of the covenant between God and Israel (and therefore in some respects indeed the *theocratical* number), of expiation and atonement, of purification and initiation (compare *Baehr*, *loc. cit*); and it must be admitted, that although the importance of the number seven has originally an astronomical source, the divine legislator nowhere alludes to its planetary character, but endows it with a purely spiritual meaning, in accordance with his usual tendency to ennoble the received idolatrous notions into original and elevating truths (compare *Cicero*, Somnium Scipionis: "Septem efficiunt distinctos intervallis modos; *qui numerus rerum omnium fere modus est*"; *Tacitus*, Hist. v. 4;

לֵיתֶךָ׃ 12 שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲשֶׂה מַעֲשֶׂיךָ וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי תִּשְׁבֹּת

"pleraque caelestium vim suam et cursum septimos per numeros conficiunt"; *Gell.* Noct. Att. iii. 10; *Plin.*, Hist. Nat. xi. 43; *Dion Cass.* xxxvii. p. 42, ed. Steph. About the week of ten and of five days, see note on xii. 3.

It is thus indisputable, that the number seven obviously predominates through all the Mosaic festivals; and even the collective number of the holy *convocations* amounts to seven, namely: *two* on Passover, *one* on Pentecost, *one* on the seventh new-moon, *one* on the Day of Atonement, and *two* on the Feast of Tabernacles; and this comprehensive and organic connection of the festivals with each other, has justly been considered as a safe guarantee of their contemporary Mosaic origin. But more extraordinary than the general festivals even, is the cycle of Sabbaths, ordained by Moses, and of course based on that sacred number. Now the Sabbath may either aim at the mental and physical recreation of the individuals, and this is the שבת *par excellence*, every seventh day of the week, of which we have already treated in the fourth commandment; or it may be directed to the interests of the landed property, and the rest from agricultural labours; and this is the שמטה, every seventh year; or it may, lastly, tend to secure the personal liberty of the Israelites, and in order to make this liberty a real boon, to accompany it with a perfect restitution of the fields to the former proprietors; and this is the יובל. It cannot be denied, that the chief principle, on which these systematic and comprehensive institutions are based, is the idea that the Israelite belongs, with his person and his property, to God; "for the land is mine, says the Lord, for you are only strangers and sojourners with me" (Lev. xxv. 23); "to *me* the children of Israel are servants; they are my servants, whom I have brought forth from the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God" (ver. 55).—On the Sabbath, which belongs to the Lord (xx. 10), the Israelite shall individually and personally elevate himself to God; in the Sabbath-year the *land* shall remain uncultivated, as God intended then to use it, as it were, for His own purposes, for the poor, the stranger, and the helpless (Lev. xxv. 6, 7); and in the jubilee, all property and persons shall be restored to their original condition, in which they were placed by the divine Law and by the first distribution of the land. This is the higher idea embodied in those peculiar institutions, which possess, however, many other collateral advantages.

The Sabbath-year (שנת שבתון, ἑβδοματικὸς or σαββατικὸς ἐνιαυτός—ἀργὸν ἔτος, *Joseph.* Bell. Jud. I. ii. 4), or *the year of remission* (שנת השמטה); for both expressions designate the same institution; although Vater and others have tried to prove the contrary (see *Hengstenb.* Auth. of the Pent. ii. p. 435-36). The precepts concerning it are: 1. In Palestine the fields and vineyards shall be cultivated for six years, and their produce gathered; but in the seventh year they shall rest. 2. That produce, however, which grows spontaneously (ספיח) belongs, for common use, to the proprietor, the servants, the hirelings, the strangers, and the beasts. 3. The people shall live from the superfluity of the preceding years, especially the sixth; compare Lev. xxv. 2—8; *Joseph.* Antiq. III. xii. 3; *Tacitus* Hist. V. iv. 3, who, however, with the usual blindness of heathen writers for Mosaic institutions, assigns the *laziness of the people* as the motive of the Sabbath-year, as, in fact, the heathens identified the Sabbath with the "Day of Saturn," probably because this planet, which completes its revolution in the longest time, was called the slow or lazy orb (see *Bohlen*, Alt. Ind. ii. p. 248). 4. Except from strangers, debts were not allowed to be exacted, since the proprietors gained no harvests (Deut. xv. 1—8; see *supra* on xxii. 24). The Israelites, therefore, when standing under Roman authority, enjoyed, in the Sabbath-year, exemption from taxes (*Joseph.*

do with thy vineyard *and* with thy oliveyard.—12. Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest: that thy ox and thy ass may rest, and the son

Antiq. XIV. x. 6); and, 5. On the Feast of Tabernacles of every seventh year the Law of Moses was to be recited in the temple to the whole nation, men and children and strangers (Deut. xxxi. 10—13). But the release of the slaves took place after the sixth year of their *servitude*, irrespective of שמטה (see p. 384). From this exposition the following accessory advantages of the Sabbath-year are evident: 1. The soil enjoyed a regular rest, doubly necessary in the imperfect state of agriculture of those ages, and calculated considerably to enhance the fertility in the other years. 2. It is supposed (according to Michaelis and others), that the Israelites, in order to prevent want or scarcity in the seventh year, economized the abundance of their harvests and stored them up, so as to be almost entirely protected against famine. (Compare, however, 1 Macc. vi. 49, 54; *Joseph.* Antiq. XIV. xvi. 2). 3. The corn trade with the heathen countries was precluded. 4. The leisure from all material and external occupations must necessarily have given a greater impulse and scope to religious life; and therein lies, no doubt, the reason of the command concerning the public reading of the Law on the Feast of Tabernacles of the Sabbath-year. It exercised, therefore, the same salutary spiritual influence upon their minds as the weekly Sabbath, by freeing them from the harassing anxieties of every-day life; it was, in fact, like it, called שבת ליי (Lev. xxv. 2); for it brought the nation freedom from that agricultural labour which was assigned to it as its ordinary occupation. When the cycles of the Sabbath-year commenced, is uncertain; the Sedar Olam Rabbah (chap. xi.) states, that they were first introduced, fourteen years after the entrance of the Hebrews into Canaan; immediately after the distribution of the land, which like its conquest (Josh. xiv. 10), lasted, according to tradition, seven years. It is, however, known, that the שמטה seems to have been almost entirely neglected before the exile (Lev. xxvi. 34; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21, from which passage it has been concluded, that it was not observed during a period of about 500 years); but that it was really carried out after the return from the Babylonian captivity (Neh. x. 31; 1 Macc. vi. 49, 53; *Joseph.* Antiq. XIII. viii. 1, etc.). Thus the Sabbath-year had an ideal and practical signification: to keep in memory the inalienable sovereignty of God, and to promote the fertility of the land; and even if the latter object should have been the ulterior aim of Moses, he has, with his usual wisdom, admirably ennobled and spiritualized it. As the jubilee is the natural and necessary development of the Sabbath and the Sabbath-year, it has been found strange, that it is here with no word alluded to (*De Wette*, Kritik. p. 284); and this circumstance has been used as a proof that the Mosaic laws have a successive and gradual origin, and that the precepts concerning the jubilee have been added at a later period. But the sketch of the laws contained in ch. xxi. to xxiii. is not intended as a complete system incorporating all laws; it is a delineation of the fundamental precepts; and the only condition which can reasonably be demanded is, that none of the detailed laws later revealed should be at variance with those precepts; which can certainly not be asserted with regard to the Sabbath-year and the jubilee. (Compare *Philo*, Opp. ii. 207, 277, 284, 631; *Mishn.*, Tr. Shebiith; *Maimon.*, Hilch. Schemiah; *Michael.*, Mos. R. § 74—76; *Baehr*, Symbol. ii. 569, 602; *Bohlen*, Gen. Intr. p. 138; *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. ii. p. 349, 350).

10. According to Ebn Ezra, Luzzato, and others, these laws are here only inserted on account of the benefits which

לְמַעַן יָנוּחַ שׁוֹרְךָ וַחֲמֹרֶךָ וְיִנָּפֵשׁ בֶּן־אֲמָתְךָ וְהַגֵּר׃ 13 וּבְכֹל אֲשֶׁר־
אָמַרְתִּי אֲלֵיכֶם תִּשָּׁמֵרוּ וְשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים לֹא תַזְכִּירוּ לֹא יִשָּׁמַע
עַל־פִּיךָ׃ 14 שָׁלֹשׁ רְגָלִים תָּחֹג לִי בַּשָּׁנָה׃ 15 אֶת־חַג הַמַּצּוֹת
תִּשְׁמֹר שִׁבְעַת יָמִים תֹּאכַל מַצּוֹת כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִךָ לְמוֹעֵד חֹדֶשׁ

they confer on the poor, the strangers, and the beasts. This may be the invisible thread by which those ordinances unfolded themselves in the mind of the inspired writer; but this did not prevent him from explaining them in their full meaning and signification.

11. שמט (Arab. سمط), to leave a field, in order to let it rest and lie uncultivated.—נטש is synonymous with שמט, as is obvious from Nehemiah x. 32, נטש את השנה השביעית, "let us suspend the cultivation of our land in the seventh year." The suffix in ונטשתה does, therefore, not refer to תבואתה, in ver. 10, but to ארצך. It appears, from Lev. xxv. 7, that the proprietor is entitled, like all other persons, to the spontaneous growth of the seventh year: the land belongs then to all in common; and the original natural state of mankind, before the individual property was marked by limits and boundaries, was thus visibly represented. From the analogy of the jubilee (Lev. xxv. 9), we may infer, that the year of release was proclaimed on the Day of Atonement, or the tenth day of the seventh month, not in Abib; for after the completion of the harvest only perfect rest of the fields could take place; and in the eighth month the new agricultual labours were, in ordinary years, commenced.—Rashbam observes, that although here vineyards and oliveyards only are mentioned, the whole vegetation produced by human labour is included in our law.

12. See on the fourth commandment, xx. 8—11. It is, however, worthy of remark, that, as here the law of Sabbath is repeated in connection with the laws of humanity and charity, the obligation to permit, on the seventh day, complete rest to the servants, the strangers, and the animals also, is again enjoined. And this is one of the features of the laws of Sabbath, in which it is distinguished from similar institutions of other nations. Cato Censorius pronounces even the contrary principle: "Mulis, equis, asinis feriæ nullæ" (De R. R. 138; compare *Macrob.*, Saturn. i. 16). The Sabbath is, indeed, the image of the whole Mosaic faith; it mirrors forth all the other precepts of the Law; its aim is sanctity, spirituality, charity, and love; knowledge of God and meditation on His revealed truths—and the same was the inward tendency of the Mosaic religion; it was the perfect separation from paganism, the opposition of materialism, and the abnegation of selfishness in favour of brotherly love; and we here, therefore, remind the reader of Montesquieu's pertinent remark: "Quoique tous les états ayent en général un même objet qui est de se maintenir, chaque état en a pourtant un qui lui est particulier. L'aggrandissement était l'objet de Rome, la guerre celui de Lacédémone, *la Religion celui des Lois Judaiques*" (De l'Esprit des Lois xi. 5).

33. Prohibition not to mention the Names of Idols. Ver. 13.

The importance of the Sabbath induces the legislator to add a general admonition to the observance of the divine commandments; and he does this with the greater propriety, as the end of the Sabbath is the inculcation and study of the Law. In order to eradicate idolatry, with all its far-spreading roots, the idols shall not only be banished from the hearts, but also from the lips; they should not even be alluded to or mentioned, much less be worshipped. And as it was forbidden to use the name of God falsely or disrespectfully (xx. 7; xxii. 27), thus

of thy handmaid, and the stranger may be refreshed.—13. And in all *things* which I have said to you be circumspect: and make no mention of the name of other gods; it shall not be heard out of thy mouth.—14. Three times thou shalt celebrate a feast to me in the year. 15. Thou shalt keep the feast of unleavened bread: seven days thou shalt eat unleavened bread, as I have commanded thee, in the time appointed of the month Abib;

the heathen deities should entirely disappear from the language. The Jewish interpreters, Rashi, Ebn Ezra, as also Jerome, understand לא תזכירו: "you shall not swear by the name of the idols;" others interpret: "you shall not give occasion to a heathen even to use the name of an idol for an oath." This sense is, however, not contained in our words; and Onkelos translates correctly: תדברון; Septuagint: ἀναμνησθήσεσθε. In the parallel passage Joshua xxiii. 7, after לא תזכירו, is expressly added, ולא תשביעו.

34. The Three Principal Festivals. Vers. 14—17.

Although Passover has predominantly a national and historical meaning, it stands yet evidently in relation with the great epochs of the agricultural year, and is therefore internally connected with Pentecost and the Feast of Tabernacles. On the first day of Passover the ripe firstling-sheaf was offered by the priest (Lev. xxiii. 10, 11; see *supra*, p. 182); then the corn-harvest commenced with the ingathering of the barley, which was followed by that of the wheat crops; and within the seven weeks between Passover and Pentecost the harvest was finished, so that on the last festival shew-bread (לחם תנופה), baked from the new corn, was offered on the altar. Hence is explicable the designation חג העצרת, "Festival of Conclusion," which was later attributed to Pentecost; it is the termination of the Passover; the harvest, commenced in the first month, was considered as finished in the third; and in this sense Philo (Opp. ii. 294) calls the Passover προέορτον ἑτέρας ἑορτῆς μείζονος: "the forerunner of another greater festival." About the autumnal equinox, the fruits, the grapes and olives, ripened. As a festival of thanksgiving for this last harvest of the year, the Feast of Tabernacles (סכות) was instituted, with which the agricultural year was regarded as concluded, and after which the rainy season generally commenced. Thus in the three festivals of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, the whole cycle of the agricultural holy-days was completed; they were festivals of thanksgiving for the blessing which God had bestowed upon the seeds; and their solemnization, the pilgrimages to the central sanctuary and the offering of sacrifices, together with the celebration of social and convivial feasts, bore at once a religious and civil, a solemn and cheerful, character.

Undoubtedly these festivals contributed also considerably to cement the *political* unity of the Hebrew nation, and to prevent dangerous animosities and jealousies among the tribes. Without the common temple, at which the whole nation periodically assembled for sacred and joyful festivities, Israel would soon have been dismembered into a variety of small and weak states; it would thus have become an easy prey to the attacks of the powerful enemies around them, and the internal connection even would soon have been loosened and dissolved. That Jeroboam did not consider the separation of the ten tribes secured as long as the people made pilgrimages to the temple of Jerusalem to participate in the common festivals, is a strong proof of the uniting influence of

הָאָבִיב כִּי־בוֹ יָצָאתָ מִמִּצְרָיִם וְלֹא־יֵרָאוּ פָנַי רֵיקָם׃ 16 וְחַג הַקָּצִיר
בִּכּוּרֵי מַעֲשֶׂיךָ אֲשֶׁר תִּזְרַע בַּשָּׂדֶה וְחַג הָאָסִף בְּצֵאת הַשָּׁנָה בְּאָסְפְּךָ

these grand institutions, and of their mighty effects upon the national character of the Israelites (1 Kings xii. 26—33; see *Mich.* Mos. R. iv. §198). It might be urged, that these regular and obligatory pilgrimages imposed upon the nation considerable sacrifices, and involved both inconvenience and expense. However, these festivals were, by the legislator, invested with a sacred character; they were represented as one of the pillars of the theocratical constitution; every Israelite felt a strong impulse to meet at once his God and his brethren from all parts of the Holy Land; and who is so devoid of all religious sentiment as to consider religious institutions impracticable because they require pecuniary and personal exertions, and not to comprehend that a nation, the very centre of whose existence is religion, will cheerfully sacrifice every worldly advantage in order to satisfy a spiritual craving? It is natural, that the Israelites who lived in foreign countries, or in Palestine very distant from Jerusalem, did not attend in the temple every year on the three festivals, as it would have been impossible to make a double journey—from Jerusalem back, and to Jerusalem again—in the short interval between Passover and Pentecost (*Theodor.*, ad Col. ii. 17). But pilgrimages to national sanctuaries were, at very early times, performed by different ancient nations. Those of the Arabs to Mecca are considered as old as the time of Abraham, who is even said himself to have made forty journeys to that city. The very Hebrew word חַג is identical with the Arabic *Hadj*. The parallel of the Mahommedan pilgrimages to Mecca assists us likewise to understand how the many thousands of guests could find room within the walls of Jerusalem. In Mecca, a town much smaller than Jerusalem was, arrive, on such occasions, more than fifty thousand strangers. "As for house-room, the inhabitants straiten themselves very much, in order at this time to make their market. As for such as come last, after the town is filled, they pitch their tents without the town, and there abide until they remove towards home. As for provision, they all bring sufficient with them, except it be of flesh, which they may have at Mecca; but all other provisions, as butter, honey, oil, olives, rice, biscuit, etc., they bring with them as much as will last through the wilderness, forward and backward, as well as the time they stay at Mecca; and so for their camels they bring store of provender, etc., with them" (Pitt). According to Herodotus (ii. 60), the Egyptians also celebrated, annually, common festivals, in appointed parts of the desert (see note on v. 1).

14. רגלים is the same as פעמים, in ver. 17, three *times*. The explanation, that the three principal festivals are called שלש רגלים because all Israelites were required to repair to Jerusalem "on foot," is futile. Compare Num. xxiii. 28: הכיתני זה שלש רגלים, "thou hast now beaten me three times." Onkelos, תלת זמנין. See *Ges.*, Thes. p. 1262 *a*.

A. 15. About Passover, and the laws connected with it, see notes to chapter xii. About חדש האביב, see on xii. 2, and ix. 31.—The words ולא יראו פני ריקם, *and none shall appear before me empty*, belong to all the three festivals, and must, therefore, not, as the English Version does, be included within parenthesis, like the precept concerning Passover. Modern commentators find in this command an analogy to the custom of Oriental nations, who were forbidden ever to appear before their kings without presents. (See *Rosenm.*, ad *loc. cit.*; ad Gen. xxxiii. 8; and Orient i. p. 165). פני is here to be taken adverbially, *before me*, like Isa. i. 12 (לראות פני), Psa. xlii. 3, identical with אל פני in ver. 17. Compare *Ew.*, Gr. Crit. p. 632.

B. 16. The signification of Pentecost

for in it thou camest out from Egypt; and none shall appear before me empty: 16. And the feast of harvest, the firstfruits of thy labours, which thou hast sown in thy fields: and the feast of ingathering at the end of the year,

is already evident from the different names which it bears: 1st. חג הקציר, in our passage, *the festival of the harvest*, as then the harvest even of the later grains, as wheat, was considered as finished. 2nd. יום הבכורים (Numb. xxviii. 26), the day on which the first loaves made from the new corn were offered on the altar, whence it is called by Philo (ii. 294), ἑορτὴ πρωτογεννημάτων; 3rd. חג שבועות, *the feast of weeks* (Deut. xvi. 10), because it was celebrated seven complete weeks, or fifty days after Passover (ver. 9), and thence the Greek name πεντηκοστή (scilicet, ἡμέρα, Pentecost), the fiftieth day (compare *Josephus*, Bell. Jud. II. iii. 1). Jewish tradition calls the festival also זמן מתן תורתנו, asserting that, on this day, the sixth of the third month, the revelation of the decalogue took place (see on xix. 2); and calls further Pentecost, figuratively, חג העצרת or festival of conclusion, since it completed, spiritually, that which Passover or the redemption from Egypt had commenced: for liberty without the divine laws would have been imperfect and useless (see, however, supra on vers. 14—17). But, even Philo makes no mention of the meaning of Pentecost as the festival of legislation, although this is, of course, the only one at present attributed to it by the Jews, as it can have for them no importance as the festival of the *harvest*. Josephus (Antiq. III. x. 6) mentions as the usual name of Pentecost, Ἀσαρθά (Asartha, עצרתא); and under this designation it occurs frequently in the Talmud. Although in Biblical phraseology, עצרת signifies assembly, especially for the purpose of celebrating festivals (πανήγυρις), later tradition has derived it from עצר, to conclude, and has understood it as the festival of conclusion, analogous to the eighth day of Succoth.

The principal passages treating of our festival are, Lev. xxiii. 15—22; Numb. xxviii. 26—31; Deut. xvi. 9—12; and we learn therefrom: 1st. Pentecost was to be celebrated on the fiftieth day after the first day of holy convocation of Passover, that is, fifty days after the sixteenth of Nisan. This is evidently the sense of the words, "from the morrow after the Sabbath" (ממחרת השבת) in Levit. xxiii. 15; for the first and seventh day of Passover are Sabbaths, days of rest, they are "מקרא קדש, no work shall be done thereon" (vers. 7, 8, compare ver. 39). Further, the text in ver. 15, qualifies the שבת more accurately, by adding: "from the day that you brought the sheaf of the wave offering," and this was done according to ver. 11, on the sixteenth day of Nisan. And thus writes Josephus (Antiq. III. x. 6): "On the second day of unleavened bread, which is the sixteenth day of the month", the first-fruits were offered in the temple, in the manner described, p. 182, and, "when a week of weeks has passed *after this sacrifice* (which weeks contain 49 days) on the fiftieth day is Pentecost." This natural interpretation, adopted by Jewish tradition, has been rejected by some sects, as the Sadducees and Karaites, who take ממחרת השבת for the day after the weekly Sabbath in the week of Passover, and, therefore, celebrate Pentecost always on a Sunday. The objections of Munk ("Some remarks about the Holidays of the Ancient Hebrews") against the traditional acceptation, are of no weight. (Compare Targum Onkelos and Jerusalem, and Ebn Ezra, on Levit. xxiii. 11, 15; Cusari, iii. 41). Still less acceptable is the opinion of Hitzig, that ממחרת השבת signifies the day after the *conclusion* of the Passover, which always began with a Sunday, and the seventh day of which was therefore a Sabbath; for it is

אֶת־מַעֲשֶׂיךָ מִן־הַשָּׂדֶה׃ 17 שָׁלֹשׁ פְּעָמִים בַּשָּׁנָה יֵרָאֶה כָּל־זְכוּרְךָ

the conjecture of that critic, that at the beginning of the year new weeks always were commenced, so that the seventh, fourteenth, and twenty-first of Abib were Sabbaths. But this interpretation not only rests on entirely unsupported suppositions, but is perfectly refuted by Baehr's apt remark (Symb. ii. p. 621), that the offering of the firstling-sheaf would, thus, literally take place *post festum*, whereas that ceremony was an integral part of the Passover rites themselves. 2nd. On Pentecost two leavened shew-breads from the new corn (מנחה חדשה ליי׳) were offered, each containing one-tenth of an ephah of flour (Levit. xxiii. 16, 17). The expression "from your habitations you shall bring them," has not been understood, by the Hebrew tradition, to mean that every Israelite was to bring two loaves, but that two were presented in all, in the name of the whole people, just as one firstling-sheaf was offered on Passover. But it was enjoined as a duty incumbent on every individual, to offer voluntary gifts according to his ability (מסת נדבת ידך, Deut. xvi. 10). After these loaves had been presented on the altar, with the rite of *waving* (תנופה), they were (two or three days later) given over for food to the priests, who were not permitted to leave anything over till the following day (*Josephus*, Antiq. III. x. 6; *Mishn.* Menach. xi. 9). 3rd. As sacrifices were to be offered, according to Levit. xxiii. 18, 19, seven lambs of the first year, one bullock, and two rams, with the necessary meat-, and drink-, offering; a kid of the goats as an expiation for sins, and two lambs of the first year, for a peace-offering. But, in Numbers xxviii. 27—31, are prescribed two bullocks, one ram, seven lambs of the first year, with the meat-, drink-, and expiatory offerings. This discrepancy of the numbers has been reconciled by Jewish tradition by the conjecture that the passage in Leviticus treats of the sacrifice which was to be connected with the oblation of the shew-bread; but that in Numbers, of the additional sacrifice (*Mishn.* Menach. iv. 2); and Josephus also adds the numbers of both passages, stating, as the required sacrifices: three bullocks for a burnt-offering, and three rams, and fourteen lambs, with two kids of the goats, as an expiation for sins. These sacrifices were also to be offered with the "rite of waving" over the firstling-bread (Levit. xxiii. 20). 4th. The day was celebrated as a מקרא קדש, "holy convocation," and every kind of labour was interdicted (ver. 21; Numb. xxviii. 26); it was a festival of joy, which all, even the servants and strangers, should equally share (Deut. xvi. 11), and which was chiefly celebrated by common repasts, and probably with dances and public games. We have historical evidence that this beautiful festival, which falls in the most lovely season of the year, was, even in the time after the exile, cheerfully and universally solemnized (*Joseph.*, Antiq. XIV. xiii. 4; XVII. xii. 2; Bellum Jud. II. iii. 1).

c. The Feast of Tabernacles (חג הסכות, *σκηνοπηγία*, or, חג האסף, by later writers simply called החג, on account of its importance) was celebrated from the fifteenth day of the seventh month Tishri, "when the season of the year is changing for winter" (*Josephus*, Antiq. III. x. 4), during seven days. The principal passages concerning this festival are: Levit. xxiii. 33—43; Numb. xxix. 12—39; Deut. xvi. 13—15. Herefrom we gather the following data: 1st. The festival is to be observed as a time of joy on account of the ingathering of the fruits and the perfectly finished harvest; hence it is called חג האסף, for it marked the end of the agricultural year (בצאת השנה, see note on xii. 2). 2nd. As, therefore, the people were, for the current year, relieved from all labour and all care, it could freely abandon itself to joy, and the legislator could justly prescribe: והיית אך שמח (Deut. xvi. 15); and in these pleasures also all the members of the community should equally participate. 3rd. As the Passover was both an agricultural and a historical festival (see on ver. 14—17), so the Feast of

when thou hast gathered in thy labours out of thy field: 17. Three times in the year all thy males shall appear

Tabernacles was also connected with the remembrance of the benign guidance with which God protected Israel in the desert; and it was therefore commanded, that every Israelite should, during the seven days of the festival, live in tabernacles, "that your generations may know that I have let the children of Israel dwell in tabernacles, when I brought them forth from the land of Egypt" (Levit. xxiii. 43); and that reminiscence could not be renewed in a more appropriate season than when the blessing of the land was safely stored up, and the rich produce of the past harvest allowed them a happy prospect into the following months of relaxation and repose. 4th. On the first day was מקרא קדש, and a Sabbath, on which every work was to be suspended. 5th. The eighth day after it was also a מקרא קדש, and a Sabbath, and is called עצרת, "festive assembly," *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. The Septuagint calls it *ἐξόδιον*, or conclusion of the festival (compare *Philo*, Opp. ii. 298, 534). The days between the second and eighth day were probably, like the middle days of Passover, passed in public amusements, especially dancing. (The etymology of the word חג, festival, leads to חוג or חגג, to go round in a circle, or, to dance; compare, 1 Sam. xxx. 15). Michaelis conjectures, that a sort of general fair was held, where the visitors from all parts of the country exhibited their wares for sale; and he compares herewith, not inappropriately, the origin of the modern commercial "masses" from the religious masses. 6th. The Israelites shall take on the first day "the fruit of a beautiful tree, branches of palm-trees, and the boughs of a thick-leaved tree, and willows of the brook," and rejoice before God seven days (Levit. xxiii. 40). This obscure precept has been understood by some sects, as the Karaites and Sadducees, to mean, that those boughs and fruits are to be applied to the adornment of the tabernacles. This conception seems to be countenanced by Nehem. viii. 15, 16, where at least two of those plants—the palm-tree, and the "thick-leaved trees"—are clearly mentioned as necessary for the construction of the tabernacles, *as has been prescribed*. But Jewish tradition commanded, that the pilgrims should take a citron (אתרג, *κίτριον*, *Josephus*) in their left hands, and a bough of the palm-tree surrounded by willows and myrtles (לולב) in their right hands, and carry them, during the service in the temple, as symbols of the manifold productions of nature. 7th. The sacrifices in the temple were extremely numerous: on the first day the burnt-offering was to consist of a sacrifice of thirteen bullocks, fourteen lambs, fifteen rams; and a kid of the goats, as an expiation for sins, with the meat-, and drink-, offering; and on the following days the same number of lambs and of rams, with the kid of the goats, but abating one of the bulls every day till they were reduced to seven only (Numb. xix. 12—39; *Josephus*, Antiq. III. x. 4). This distinction in the character of the sacrifices, imparted to the festival a peculiar dignity, and it is called by Josephus and Philo, the holiest of all festivals (*ἑορτὴ σφόδρα ἁγιωτάτη καὶ μεγίστη*, Antiq. VIII. iv, 1; *Philo*, ii. 286). Hereto we add, that on the Feast of Tabernacles of every Sabbath-year, the Law was publicly read in the temple (Deut. xxxi. 10; see supra, p. 451). It is therefore not surprising, that Jewish tradition developed the laws concerning this festival with extraordinary predilection, and compiled very complicated rituals concerning the construction of the tabernacles, the four kinds of fruits (Lev. xxiii. 40), etc. (see Tract. Succah). About the libations performed by the priests on each of the seven days, at the western side of the altar, see *Mishn.*, Succah iv. 9, 10; and about the great illumination in the ante-court of the women on great golden candelabra, on the first day, and about the festivities held on this occa-

אֶל־פְּנֵי הָאָדֹן ׀ יְהוָה׃ 18 לֹא־תִזְבַּח עַל־חָמֵץ דַּם־זִבְחִי וְלֹא־יָלִין

sion, see Succ. v. 2—4. According to Nehem. viii. 17, the Feast of Tabernacles was, before the exile, not legally celebrated by the Israelites. It is interesting to read the description of this festival given by Plutarch (Sympos. IV. vi. 2), who finds it perfectly analogous to the Greek Bacchic festivals, believes the branch of the palm-tree to be a thyrsus, and mentions the Levites, whom he believes to have been called so either from "Lysius," (Λύσιος), or, Euius (Εὔιος)! which latter statement must be very perplexing for those who think Plutarch to have been deeply and thoroughly versed in Biblical literature (see on ii. 4). Compare on the three great festivals, *Michaelis*, Mos. R. iv. 197—199 (who proves, also, that the celebration of these three festivals exercised an important influence on the regulation of the Hebrew calendar, since they all depended on the state of agricultural produce, and, consequently on the effects of the sun; and if, for instance, it could be foreseen in the twelfth month of the year, that, in the midst of the following Nisan, the corn would not yet be ripe, a month was intercalated to enable the Israelites to solemnize Passover properly by offering the firstling-sheaf in the temple). בצאת השנה, *at the end of the year*; that is, when another year has commenced; for the new labours of the field were begun in the eighth month, or, as Mendelssohn explains: "after the year is finished, and a new year has commenced." In xxxiv. 22, תקופת השנה, "the circuit of the year" is used synonymously with the expression of our verse.

17. Rashbam finds in the phrase: "before the Lord God" (אל־פני האדן יי׳), an allusion to the promise later given by God in the parallel passage xxxiv. 21—26: "neither shall any man desire thy land, when thou wilt go up to appear before the Lord thy God thrice in the year" (ver. 24). If indeed the Israelites celebrated their seven and eight days' festivals of Passover and Tabernacles conscientiously and in accordance with the Mosaic precepts, which command every male Israelite (כל זכורך) to attend in Jerusalem, it is certainly an extraordinary fact, that the numerous and so inveterate enemies of the Israelites did not avail themselves of these times of defencelessness, to invade and to subdue the provinces. But it appears from the passage of Nehemiah above quoted, and from other evidences, that before the exile these festivals were not very scrupulously observed; and concerning the time after the exile, the historical accounts are defective. Our text enjoins too distinctly that every year all male Israelites shall appear before God, to admit the supposition, that not the attendance of all Hebrews in the same year was required, or that in the Sabbath-year the concourse of the people was greater; or that the whole nation was *represented through the elders* (*Saalschütz*, Mos. R. p. 422—428; compare *supra*, p. 454).—Rosenmüller observes correctly: "This belonged necessarily to a theocratical constitution. God is considered as the king, and the subjects assemble thrice every year to do Him homage"; and similarly Mendelssohn: "He is the lord and proprietor of the land; therefore shalt thou, at appointed times, appear before Him like a servant before his master, and shalt offer Him presents as a mark of thy loyalty and allegiance."

Let us, with a few words, recapitulate once more the tendency and meaning of the "three festivals." Passover is the commencement of the harvest; seven weeks ensue, which by their very number are marked as holy; then follows the day of conclusion, or Pentecost, which, as the culminating point of harvest, can possibly only last one day, not seven days like the two corresponding festivals. The time of the harvest is, therefore, sacred, devoted to God; it reminded incessantly that the blessing of the land, that every nourishment and support comes from Him alone; and thus, in the midst of the gathering

before the Lord God.—18. Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread: neither shall the fat

of material property, the religious doctrines of faith and humility were kept alive; and, in the midst of the lavish gifts of nature, the thoughts were directed to the God of Israel, who had, in Egypt, so obviously proved Himself as the Lord of nature, and the omnipotent sovereign of the world, by the redemption of His people. The bread which was offered on Pentecost, was of wheat, whilst the firstling-sheaf of Passover was barley; for the harvest was finished; all crops were gathered in; and the offering of God was naturally of the best and choicest grain. That bread was leavened, because it represented the daily, ordinary food; it was not the raw material, it was the prepared food itself, from an analogous reason; *two* loaves were presented, accompanied by *two* lambs (whilst on Passover *one* sheaf and *one* lamb were offered), because the happy conclusion of the harvest was necessarily marked by a greater gift of gratitude than its commencement. The lambs were, on Pentecost, sacrificed as a eucharistic offering, not as a holocaust, as on Passover,—for Pentecost was in its nature and tendency a festival of thanks and rejoicing.—In an internal historical relation with Passover stands the Feast of Tabernacles; the one created Israel as a nation, the other symbolizes its preservation; in the one, God showed Himself as the rescuer of Israel, in the other as their permanent king; the one represents His justice and omnipotence, the other His providence and love; the one exhorts to grateful adoration, the other to unshaken belief; and this belief is typified by living eight days in moveable, frail, and unsafe tabernacles—at once a remembrance of past protection and help, and an emblem of the eternal confidence in His grace and His faithful guidance. And thus the Feast of Tabernacles is, from another point of view, also a festival of covenant both between God and every individual Israelite, and between God and Israel, as His people; all the Mosaic festivals emanate systematically from the same sublime ideas of sanctity and truth. But externally also, with regard to the produce of the soil, the Feast of Tabernacles is connected with the two other festivals. It marks the perfect conclusion of the agricultural year; not the corn only which belongs to the necessities of life, but the fruits also, and wine and oil, which serve for the cheerfulness, the enjoyment and recreation of life, were gathered in; the whole abundance of the year could be overlooked; the Feast of Tabernacles recalled likewise the remembrance of Pentecost, which again reminded of Passover (Deut. xvi. 13); thus the former included, as it were, the two other festivals; both its character was more cheerful, and its tendency was larger and more comprehensive; and hence the names are explicable, with which it was designated as the greatest of all festivals, as the festival κατ' ἐξοχήν (see p. 457); and the multiplied sacrifices, which consisted of seventy bullocks, and of two rams and fourteen lambs daily; the number seventy (being seven multiplied by ten) is not accidental; and the circumstance, that on the last day *seven* bullocks were sacrificed, is not insignificant.—And whilst the thankful mind regarded the results of the labour of the year, it was, in general, reminded of the providence of God, which rules over centuries and nations with the same love with which it has watched over the short space of one civil year, and over the activity of one individual. Thus meet the external and internal significations of this beautiful festival. The very tabernacles represent those two ideas; their construction shows the unbounded confidence in God, and their materials represent the gifts of God, the rewarded and justified faith (see *Baumgarten*, Comm. I. ii. 42, *et seq.*; *Baehr*, Symb. ii. p. 645—664).

חֵלֶב־חַגִּי עַד־בֹּקֶר׃ 19 רֵאשִׁית בִּכּוּרֵי אַדְמָתְךָ תָּבִיא בֵּית יְהוָה
אֱלֹהֶיךָ לֹא־תְבַשֵּׁל גְּדִי בַּחֲלֵב אִמּוֹ׃ פ ששי

35. Supplementary Law about the Paschal Sacrifice. Ver. 18.

The celebration of Passover began with the solemn offering of the paschal-lamb; after this introductory ritual, the holy festival was considered as fully commenced; and it was consequently necessary, to remove everything leavened *before* the killing of the lamb, and thence the precept: "*thou shalt not offer* (לא־תזבח) *the blood of my sacrifice* (זבחי, according to xxxiv. 25: זבח חג הפסח; compare xii. 27) *with* (על) *leavened bread*"; that is, whilst leavened bread is still in your houses (see about חָמֵץ, note on xii. 15). And as the paschal-lamb was a symbol of the national covenant between God and Israel, and as it was to be consumed as a *whole* by the *whole* congregation (xii. 3, 6, 9), it was neither allowed to leave any part of its flesh till the morning (xii. 10), nor of its fat; for the one was the portion of the Israelites, the other that of God; wherefore Moses ordains: "neither shall the fat of my sacrifice (חג, as in Isa. xxix. 1; Mal. ii. 3; Ps. cxviii. 27) remain until the morning" (see p. 198).—The Septuagint begins this verse with the words of xxxiv. 24: *ὅταν γὰρ ἐκβάλω τὰ ἔθνη ἀπὸ προσώπου σου καὶ ἐμπλατύνω τὰ ὅριά σου.*

19. First part. On the offering of the first fruits, see note to xxii. 28, 29.

36. The Law about the "Kid and the Milk of its Mother." Ver. 19; Second Part.

לא־תבשל גדי בחלב אמו, *Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk.* The meaning and tendency of this remarkable law, which is repeated three times (xxxiv. 26; Deut. xiv. 21) can only be ascertained from the context, in which it is introduced. In our passage and in Deut. xxxiv. 26, it follows immediately after the precept concerning the offering of firstling-fruits; and it must, therefore, no doubt stand in some relation to the products of agriculture. This simple consideration leads us to certain accounts, calculated to spread some light over this obscure precept. Ancient interpreters already, as the Karaites, inform us that it was customary among heathen nations, after all fruits had been gathered in, to choose a kid; to boil it in the milk of its mother, and then to sprinkle this milk, under mysterious rites, upon their trees, fields, gardens, and orchards, in the belief, that they became thereby more fertile, and that they would, in the ensuing year, yield a more abundant produce. And most probably, in order to destroy among the Israelites this pagan custom, that law was enjoined; for firstling-fruits of fields, which had by that ceremonial received fictitious fertility, and which had thus become objects of superstitious practices, were an abomination to the Lord. Abarbanel mentions a similar custom even in the Occident, for instance, in Spain and England; he writes: "It is the custom in the kingdom of Spain, to this very day, that all shepherds assemble twice every year to deliberate on their affairs, and to stipulate laws concerning their cattle when they kill young animals, boil them, etc., and I learnt as an authentic fact, that the same custom prevails in that distant isle called England." And Clericus compares with this law the custom, that among many ancient nations a kid or a goat was sacrificed to Bacchus, because nothing is more injurious to the vine than their bite (*Virg.*, Georg. ii. 359, 380, 390); it was therefore not impossible that similar notions prevailed among the tribes which surrounded the Israelites, and that a law forbidding such perverse customs was thus necessary. See also *Spencer*, De Leg. Mos. Ritual. II. viii. 2.

But further, in Deut. xiv. 21, that prohibition follows after the laws concerning the allowed and forbidden food; however, the general principle of the prohibition

of my festival *sacrifice* remain until the morning.— 19. The first of the firstfruits of thy land thou shalt bring into the house of the Lord thy God.—Thou shalt not

against the use of any flesh of torn beasts (נבלה), is added: for "thou art a holy nation to the Lord thy God; thou shalt not seethe the kid in the milk of its mother." We are almost compelled by this connection of "the holy nation" with our prohibition, to recognise in the latter a direct moral meaning, since the holiness generally includes a refinement of manners and ennoblement of moral sentiments. And this reason is adduced by many ancient interpreters. Abarbanel remarks: "the principal end of this law is to prevent unfeeling cruelty," and it is in this respect analogous to the precept, not to kill a beast and its mother on the same day (Lev. xxii. 28). Ebn Ezra observes: "It is needless for us to search the reason of that prohibition, for it is concealed from the eyes of even the wise; but perhaps it was enjoined, because it is a cruelty to seethe the kid with the milk of its mother" (compare *Rashbam*; but even Mendelssohn considered the attempt of searching after the reason of this law as a hopeless toil: "the benefit arising from the many inexplicable laws of God is in their practice, not in the understanding of their motives; it must suffice for us to know, that they are of divine origin"). And it appears cruel indeed, and hard-hearted almost to mockery, to seethe the young animal in that very milk, which nature had destined to its own nourishment (see *Bochart*, Hieroz. I. ii. 52; Luzzatto *ad hunc locum*). But travellers report, that even at present the Arabs do not boil their meat in water, but in sour milk (Labbin; see *Rosenm.*, Orient vi. p. 258). Maimonides considers it objectionable in a sanitary point of view (Moreh iii. 48): "As to the prohibition, not to eat meat boiled in milk, we are of opinion, that such meat is too compact a food, which engenders surfeit." But he adds also the conjecture, that this law was intended to prevent some pagan rite.—That גדי stands here for every eatable, pure mammal generally, is self-evident, as similarly in xxi. 35, ox, in xxiii. 5, ass, etc.; and, in fact, גדי seems to mean any young animal; if it is intended to denote *kid*, גדי עזים is used, Gen. xxxviii. 17. Ebn Ezra and Abarbanel quote the opinion of some expositors, who take בשל here in the signification of "ripening or growing," and explain: "let not the young firstling-fetus grow up by the milk of the mother, but sacrifice it to God on the eighth day after its birth" (xxii. 29); but Ebn Ezra justly remarks, that the word בשל (to cook) is certainly used of the ripening of fruits by the heat of the sun (Joel iv. 13; Gen. xl. 10), but not of the natural growth of the animals by suckling. Besides, the notion of *firstling* is no way intimated in the text (גדי), and is in Deut. xiv. 21, incompatible with the context. — The very artificial conjecture of Michaelis (Mos. R. iv. § 295) is now, we believe, universally discarded. He takes אמן generally, as sheep, or any other animal, and believes, that Moses intended to forbid roasting and boiling with *milk*, and to accustom the Israelites to the use of olive-oil, which abounded in Palestine; thus they would perceive the superiority of the Holy Land over Egypt, and never be tempted to return again thither. It is certainly a novel legislative experiment, to strengthen patriotism by the aid of the culinary art. Besides, whether אמן can be taken in that general sense as *animal*, is a point which is equally questionable in a grammatical and lexicographical respect. Luther translates: "thou shalt not seethe the kid whilst it is still sucking its mother's milk." If our law applies to sacrifices or to firstlings, it would coincide with Levit. xxii. 27; if to other animals, it would be a sanitary precept; but it is doubtful whether בחלב can be taken in that elliptical sense. "We know no more," says Ewald (Antiq. p. 223), "by what revolting sight this prohibition

20 הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי שֹׁלֵחַ מַלְאָךְ לְפָנֶיךָ לִשְׁמָרְךָ בַּדָּרֶךְ וְלַהֲבִיאֲךָ אֶל־
הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר הֲכִנֹתִי׃ 21 הִשָּׁמֶר מִפָּנָיו וּשְׁמַע בְּקֹלוֹ אַל־תַּמֵּר

may have been called forth, but evidently that phrase became a kind of memorial by which Israel should always be reminded of that tender mildness and considerate humanity which was to distinguish it from the barbarous nations. As such a pithy dictum this sentence concludes the whole series of laws in *the Book of the Covenant*, and is in perfectly the same manner repeated in later groups of laws; Exod. xxxiv. 26; Deut. xiv. 21; compare Levit. xxii. 28; Deut. xxii. 6, *et seq.*" It is well known that Jewish tradition found, in the words of our text, a general prohibition against eating meat and milk together in any way or form whatever, and applied the threefold repetition of the law to the interdiction of eating (אכילה), profit or advantage (הנאה), and cooking (בשול). The Talmud has devoted considerable sections to all possible consequences of this interpretation of the law, which was likewise extended to birds (see Chulin, viii; Sanhedr. iv). That other Asiatic tribes do not know such law or custom, is, for instance, testified by Layard (Discoveries, p. 289): "The dish usually seen in a Bedouin tent is a mass of boiled meat, sometimes mixed with onions, upon which a lump of fresh butter is placed and allowed to melt."

20—33. The sketch of the fundamental laws is concluded; the most necessary moral, religious, and civil precepts have been enjoined, and the little and original "Book of the Covenant" (ספר הברית xxiv. 6) is completed (see p. 377). Very appropriately, exhortations are added, faithfully to adhere to these laws; and, as rewards, are promised, the special providence of God, the safe guidance to the Holy Land, and the destruction of the enemies. The latter part of our chapter forms a suitable resting-point in the progress of the specification of the legal injunctions. The decalogue is the embryo or the innermost kernel of the legislation; in always larger circles and always richer development, the divine precepts unfold themselves from this germ. First a summary (the decalogue); then an outline (chaps. xxi—xxiii); and then only the whole and complete system of the legislation in its minutest detail. So lucid is this arrangement of the sacred materials, that about the *leading ideas* of the most special laws no uncertainty, no doubt, is possible; and so systematical is the gradual progress, that it must be intelligible for the most ordinary comprehension.

The promises of God, after the promulgation of this outline of the theocratical laws, are: He will be the enemy of Israel's enemies (ver. 22); He will strike them with consternation and terror (ver. 27), and confound them even by the terrors of nature (ver. 28); He will lead His people by a messenger into the Holy Land, and will there also destroy their enemies (vers. 20, 23), not at once and suddenly, but gradually (vers. 29, 30); and He will extend their territory in the south to the Red Sea, and in the east to the Euphrates (ver. 31); lastly, they will always enjoy an abundance of provisions, be exempted from disease and pestilence (ver. 25), reach a vigorous old age, and increase uninterruptedly (ver. 26).—But, on the other hand, the conditions of all these blessings are, that they faithfully and willingly follow the divine messenger (ver. 21), and serve God (ver. 25), never worship the heathen idols, but destroy them everywhere (ver. 24), not conclude an alliance with the heathens themselves (ver. 32), and even not allow them to live in their midst, as they would be seduced by them to idolatry, and thus be led to their inevitable ruin (ver. 33).

20. *Behold I send a messenger* (מלאך) *before thee.* It may naturally be expected, that on the meaning of the מלאך, whom God promised to send as a guide for the Israelites, the most dissenting opinions

seethe a kid in its mother's milk.—20. Behold, I send [1]a messenger before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. 21. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions; for my name *is* in

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—An angel.

have been proposed. Some see in him the Son of God, who is identical with God (compare 1 Corinth. x. 9); but, from Exod. xxxiii. 2, 3, it is perfectly evident, that the מלאך and God are *different* beings: God promises to expel the enemies by a מלאך; He will Himself not go with the Israelites; for it cannot be admitted, that the מלאך of our passage is different from that mentioned in xxxiii. 2. Others (Herder, Rosenmüller, Vater) understand by מלאך here, the pillar of fire and of cloud, which is, indeed, in xiv. 19, also called "the angel of God." But the pillars are only symbols of divine providence, and precede the Israelites to lead them through the trackless desert: how can we apply to them expressions like: "Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions"? (ver. 21). The pillars are tacit guides of the marches of Israel; to issue commands, or to punish disobedience, is certainly contrary to their nature (see note on xiii. 21, 22). The remark of Vater, "that from the pillar of cloud the commands of God proceed," proves nothing for the obedience due to the pillar itself; the place where a being dwells is not identical with that being. Others take מלאך as God Himself, or His *providence;* but the expression, "*I send* a messenger" (הנה אנכי שלח מלאך), proves, that it is not God Himself; and the words of the twenty-first verse, just quoted, show, that no abstract notion, but a concrete visible being is spoken of. The same must be objected to "the Torah or the ark of the covenant," which others have understood. Even the beautiful idea which Philippson finds in our words, "that Israel advances and flourishes under the special and immediate guidance of God, whilst the destinies of other nations are dependent on the concatenation of external events happening after His plan," even this idea lies too far from the simple tenor of our text. We are, therefore, compelled to take here מלאך in its original meaning, as *messenger* (as in Arabic, and very frequently in Hebrew, 1 Sam. xi. 3; Job i. 14; etc.), and to refer it to Moses and his successor Joshua, who are, in more than one passage, called the messengers of God. The expression מלאך is, elsewhere, also used for prophet (Hagg. i. 13; Mal. iii. 1), priest (Eccles. v. 5; Mal ii. 7), and, once, even the people of Israel, "which is the messenger of God and the teacher of the nations" (Isa. xlii. 19). See *Gesenius*, Thes. p. 737 *a*. But God's messengers are, as His representatives, filled with a heavenly spirit; God speaks through them (ver. 22); His name is in them (ver. 21); therefore the commands, "Obey the voice of my messenger," and, "Do all that I shall say," are identical (ver. 22); for elsewhere also God and His מלאך are introduced promiscuously (see note to iii. 4; compare xxxiii. 2). Only about the time of the Babylonian exile, when, by the influence of the Chaldean dogmas of Zoroaster, the angelology was very considerably enlarged, the angels appeared as personal beings different from God; they then became the mediators between man and God, and were no more identified with God. Therefore the opinion of the Jewish commentators is also questionable, who understand here a *real* angel; some the *Metatron* (מטטרן, from μετὰ-θρόνος), because the letters of his name have, like שדי, the numerical value of 314 (with reference to ver. 21: כי שמי בקרבו); others (as Ebn Ezra and Nachmanides), *Michael*, after an uncertain allusion in

בּוֹ כִּי לֹא יִשָּׂא לְפִשְׁעֲכֶם כִּי שְׁמִי בְּקִרְבּוֹ׃ 22 כִּי אִם־שָׁמֹעַ
תִּשְׁמַע בְּקֹלוֹ וְעָשִׂיתָ כֹּל אֲשֶׁר אֲדַבֵּר וְאָיַבְתִּי אֶת־אֹיְבֶיךָ וְצַרְתִּי
אֶת־צֹרְרֶיךָ׃ 23 כִּי־יֵלֵךְ מַלְאָכִי לְפָנֶיךָ וֶהֱבִיאֲךָ אֶל־הָאֱמֹרִי
וְהַחִתִּי וְהַפְּרִזִּי וְהַכְּנַעֲנִי הַחִוִּי וְהַיְבוּסִי וְהִכְחַדְתִּיו׃ 24 לֹא־תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה
לֵאלֹהֵיהֶם וְלֹא תָעָבְדֵם וְלֹא תַעֲשֶׂה כְּמַעֲשֵׂיהֶם כִּי הָרֵס תְּהָרְסֵם
וְשַׁבֵּר תְּשַׁבֵּר מַצֵּבֹתֵיהֶם׃ 25 וַעֲבַדְתֶּם אֵת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וּבֵרַךְ
אֶת־לַחְמְךָ וְאֶת־מֵימֶיךָ וַהֲסִרֹתִי מַחֲלָה מִקִּרְבֶּךָ׃ ס שביעי 26 לֹא
תִהְיֶה מְשַׁכֵּלָה וַעֲקָרָה בְּאַרְצֶךָ אֶת־מִסְפַּר יָמֶיךָ אֲמַלֵּא׃

Dan. x. 13. Refractoriness against God's messenger is equivalent to disobedience to God Himself; and dissatisfaction of the former will call down the wrath of the latter (ver. 21). Thus the messenger of God has certainly "divine qualities," but only in so far as he fulfils his mission as the divine delegate, just as the prophets are the mouth of God in their *inspired* effusions, but not in all other relations.—From the preceding remarks, the impropriety of the question is obvious, why God promises to lead the Israelites through a messenger rather than personally? Some allege, because God foresaw the sins of the golden calf (xxxiii. 3); others, "because Israel might easily profane God's presence, and thus load great sins upon themselves." But the messenger and God are *virtually* identical; the former is the representative of the latter; Providence requires a concrete personification, and this is "the man of God," Moses.—The Samaritan codex, the Septuagint, and the Vulgate, have here, like ver. 23, "*my* angel," and the Septuagint and the Arabic add, at the end of the verse, לך, "to thee."

21. As the messenger acts in the name of God, obedience to His commands is a godly duty, and obstinacy will find no pardon, which *he* has no power to promise and which *I* shall not grant. — תַּמֵּר is a form quite analogous to יָסֵב in xiii. 18. As the latter is derived from סבב, and is used instead of יָסֵב, the former comes from מרר, and stands instead of תָּמֵר; but מרר has borrowed the signification from מרה, "to be rebellious, contumacious," as *vice versa* in 2 Kings xiv. 26, the root מָרָה, is used in the sense of מרר, "to be bitter" (עני ישראל מרה מאד: "the affliction of Israel was very bitter"). Besides, the verbs ע״ע and ל״ה are frequently kindred, as שרר and שרה, "to govern," etc. — *For my name is in him*, that is, my power, my divine spirit, is in him. About the signification of שם, as essence and nature of God, see note on iii. 13. Onkelos translates: "for his words are *spoken* in my name." This acceptation has been adopted by Ebn Ezra, Mendelssohn, and others, who, therefore, closely connect these words with "obey his voice." But the interpretation of שם as "essence of God," is more profound, and requires no forced transposition of the words; and thus explains Luzzato שמי by אלהותי.

22. About the transition from the third person (בקולו) into the first (אדבר), see on ver. 20.—כי אם, "hearken to his voice, *for if* thou doest so... then," etc.— צַרְתִּי, from צרר=צור, "to urge, to press;" Onkelos, correctly, ואעיק. The Septuagint renders this verse thus: 'Εὰν [כי omitted] ἀκοῇ ἀκούσητε [in Hebrew, תשמע is singular] τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς [בקלי, translated instead of בקלו, see *supra*], καὶ ποιήσῃς πάντα ὅσα ἂν ἐντείλωμαί σοι [σοι added], ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν· ἐμὴ

him. 22. [1]For if thou wilt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak; then I will be an enemy to thy enemies, and an adversary to thy adversaries. 23. For my [2]messenger shall go before thee, and bring thee to the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites: and I will destroy them. 24. Thou shalt not bow down to their gods, nor [3]be induced to serve them, nor do after their works; but thou shalt utterly overthrow them, and quite break down their images. 25. And you shall serve the Lord your God, and He will bless thy bread, and thy water: and I will take sickness away from the midst of thee.—26. There shall [4]be no aborting, nor barren woman in thy land: the number of thy days I will fulfil. 27. I

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—But. [2] Angel. [3] Serve. [4] Nothing cast their young, nor be barren.

γάρ ἐστι πᾶσα ἡ γῆ, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἔσεσθέ μοι βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα καὶ ἔθνος ἅγιον. Ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα ἐρεῖς τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ [the words, from *ἔσεσθε*, are added from xix. 5, 6: והייתם לי סגלה מכל העמים כי לי כל הארץ : ואתם תהיו לי ממלכת כהנים וגוי קדוש אלה הדברים אשר תדבר אל בני ישראל :].—*Ἐὰν ἀκοῇ ἀκούσητε....ἐχθρεύσω τοῖς ἐχθροῖς σου καὶ ἀντικείσομαι τοῖς ἀντικειμένοις σοι.*

23. About the nations here enumerated, see notes on iii. 8, and xiii. 5. The messenger will guide the Israelites, but God Himself will destroy the enemies. About the verb כחד, see note on ix. 15.

24. As after the decalogue (xx. 20), here also the prohibition of idolatry is prominently repeated, since the pure undefiled monotheism constitutes the whole basis of the divine covenant with Israel (see note on xx. 3—6); and Ebn Ezra expresses this idea vigorously thus: "At the beginning of the *Book of the Covenant*, God warned the Israelites against idolatry; and, at its conclusion, He repeats the same admonition......but there is this difference, that at the beginning God merely prohibited the making of any gods of silver or gold besides Himself, whilst, at the end, He ordered them to destroy all idols which they would find in the land of Canaan, and which the former inhabitants had made; for the idolator is like one who trespasses against all the prohibitions of the Law; and all his positive acts of righteousness are of no avail to him, either in this or in the future world." Israel's vocation is its opposition to paganism; and the culminating point of this opposition is the majesty and omnipotence of God compared with the vanity of the pagan deities.

25. The blessing will consist in abundance of the necessaries of life and vigorous health. לחם is used for any food; מים, for any drink. It is well known that the eastern nations are sparing in the use of flesh; bread forms their principal food; and hence the comprehensive meaning of this word; and travellers inform us that three persons in four live entirely upon it, or upon such compositions as are made of barley or wheat flour; see xv. 26. Ebn Ezra proves metaphysically and psychologically, that, as the observance of the divine behests secures to the mind the government over the passions of the physical man, health and long life are the natural consequences of piety.

26. שַׁכֵּל, to suffer abortion, from שכל, to be childless. A woman who aborts

27 אֶת־אֵימָתִי אֲשַׁלַּח לְפָנֶיךָ וְהַמֹּתִי אֶת־כָּל־הָעָם אֲשֶׁר תָּבֹא בָּהֶם
וְנָתַתִּי אֶת־כָּל־אֹיְבֶיךָ אֵלֶיךָ עֹרֶף׃ 28 וְשָׁלַחְתִּי אֶת־הַצִּרְעָה
לְפָנֶיךָ וְגֵרְשָׁה אֶת־הַחִוִּי אֶת־הַכְּנַעֲנִי וְאֶת־הַחִתִּי מִלְּפָנֶיךָ׃ 29 לֹא
אֲגָרְשֶׁנּוּ מִפָּנֶיךָ בְּשָׁנָה אֶחָת פֶּן־תִּהְיֶה הָאָרֶץ שְׁמָמָה וְרַבָּה עָלֶיךָ
חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה׃ 30 מְעַט מְעַט אֲגָרְשֶׁנּוּ מִפָּנֶיךָ עַד אֲשֶׁר תִּפְרֶה
וְנָחַלְתָּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ׃ 31 וְשַׁתִּי אֶת־גְּבֻלְךָ מִיַּם־סוּף וְעַד־יָם פְּלִשְׁתִּים
וּמִמִּדְבָּר עַד־הַנָּהָר כִּי ׀ אֶתֵּן בְּיֶדְכֶם אֵת יֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ וְגֵרַשְׁתָּמוֹ

her children, observes Rashi, or whose children die, is called משכלה. The abundance of children which is here promised, secures permanence to Israel as a nation, whilst longevity is the immediate reward of the individual; but for the Israelite who lived with his hopes and his longings in the future, both blessings are equally important.

27. About המם, to confound, to disturb, put to flight, see xiv. 24; Sept. *ἐκστήσω*; Jonathan, אשגש, and thus, after Rashi's quotation, Onkelos also, although we read in our present editions, ואיתבר, I shall break, or ruin. Rashi justly rejects the translation of וְהַמֹּתִי by, "I shall kill, cut off," as the corresponding form of מות would be וְהֵמַתִּי, Hos. ix. 16.—To "give, or, to show the neck" (Latin, *terga dare*, or, vertere) is the usual phrase for *to flee*; therefore, transitively used, *to put to flight*, Psalm xviii. 41. Mendelssohn considers עֹרֶף as an adverb, like ריקם , קוממיות. About the fulfilment of the assurance here given, see Josh. ii. 9—11.

28. As God promised to Israel (ver. 20), that He would send "His messenger" to assist them, so He threatens the enemies that He will send את־הצרעה, to destroy them. According to this analogy, Augustin and others who understand מלאך there as angel, take here צרעה as demon, evil spirit, which deserves no refutation. The analogy of the preceding verse: "I will send my fear (אימתי) before thee," shows that אימה and צרעה have, in some respects, a synonymous meaning. But almost all ancient versions render צרעה with *hornet*; so the Septuagint, *τὰς σφηκίας*; Vulgate, crabrones; so the Syrian and Arab. Erp.; Onkelos and Jonathan imitate the Hebrew root, ערעיתא and אורעיתא; similarly explain Kimchi, Rashi, Bechai, and, even in the Talmud, דבש צרעים (honey of wasps) is mentioned; for, according to *Aristotle* (Hist. Nat. v. 23; ix. 43), the wasps also prepare an inferior sort of honey. This signification of hornet is also appropriate in the two parallel passages, in which צרעה is mentioned, Deut. vii. 20, and Josh. xxiv. 12. Now it must be admitted, that by hornets not only individuals have been dangerously injured, but whole armies have been seriously inconvenienced (*Aelian*, xi. 28; xvii. 35; *Ammian. Marc.* xxiv. 8; compare *Bochart*, Hieroz. iii. 407, *et seq.* Ed. Lips.; compare *Rosenmüller*, Orient ii. p. 87, 88, who takes here צרעה, literally, as hornets, but, in his commentary, figuratively, as "varii generis mala."). But we need scarcely observe, that a systematic expulsion of the numerous hostile nations of Canaan by swarms of hornets, "without sword or bow" of the Israelites (Josh. xxiv. 12), would be one of the very greatest miracles, which would no doubt have been repeatedly dilated upon in the later historical accounts. But, on the one hand, except in that one passage in Joshua, we find no further mention of such a fact; and, on the other hand, we read, in all historical books of the Old Testament, how the Israelites conquer

will send my fear before thee, and will [1]confound all the people to whom thou wilt come, and I will make all thy enemies turn their backs to thee. 28. And I shall send hornets before thee, which will drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite from before thee.—29. I shall not drive them out before thee in one year; lest the land become desolate, and the beasts of the field multiply against thee. 30. By little and little I shall drive them out from before thee, until thou be increased, and wilt inherit the land. 31. And I shall set thy boundaries from the Red Sea even to the Sea of the Philistines, and from the desert to the river: for I shall deliver the inhabitants of the land into your hand; and thou shalt drive them

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Destroy.

and destroy their enemies in the usual manner, by battles and pursuits. It will thus be easy to arrive at an opinion concerning the dispute of the Talmud (in Sotah 36 *a*), whether one or two armies of hornets accompanied the Israelites; whether they preceded only Moses to the Jordan, or whether they followed Joshua also beyond it, etc. As, therefore, צרעה, according to the authority of the old versions, signifies really, hornet; but as an actual destruction of the enemies by hornets is neither probable in itself, nor clearly mentioned as a miracle: it follows that we must understand צרעה metaphorically, as any plague or punishment which God will inflict upon the enemies, in order to deliver them up the easier into the hands of the Israelites; and thus the conclusion offers itself spontaneously, to take צרעה in its *signification* here nearly identical with אימה in the preceding verse; and, in fact, etymologically, consternation is the primitive meaning of צרעה (from صرع, to overthrow; compare Gen. xxxv. 5; Deut. vii. 23). In order to impress this promise more energetically upon the minds of the Israelites, it is repeated in two metaphors, which are, however, internally identical. Therefore, the explanations of Ebn Ezra, who compares צרעה with צרעת, *leprosy*, and takes it even for a similar disease, "which weakens the strength of the body"; and of Saadiah, who translates العلة, *disease*, are not appropriate, since disease does not *drive the enemies out of the land*.

29, 30. The expulsion of the hostile tribes has been promised; but it is a new proof of the divine love, that this expulsion was not to take place suddenly and rapidly; for the Israelites were not yet numerous enough to fill the whole extensive land, which was to be their inheritance (ver. 31); the population would, in many parts, be so scanty (שממה), that the wild beasts would spread there, and cause serious devastations. Therefore the conquest of the land would be effected gradually (מעט מעט), till the number of the people would have adequately increased.

31. The ideal extent of the promised land will be: from the Red Sea (ים סוף, see on x. 19) to the Mediterranean Sea (ים פלשתים, for the Philistines inhabited the south-western part of the coast); and from the Arabic desert (מדבר, in which the Israelites were then encamping) to the Euphrates (הנהר, the river κατ' ἐξοχήν, as in Isaiah vii. 20, viii. 7; called

מִפָּנֶיךָ׃ 32 לֹא־תִכְרֹת לָהֶם וְלֵאלֹהֵיהֶם בְּרִית 33 לֹא יֵשְׁבוּ
בְּאַרְצְךָ פֶּן־יַחֲטִיאוּ אֹתְךָ לִי כִּי תַעֲבֹד אֶת־אֱלֹהֵיהֶם כִּי־יִהְיֶה לְךָ
לְמוֹקֵשׁ׃ פ

also "the great river," Gen. xv. 18; Deut. i. 7; and so here the Sept., *μεγάλου ποταμοῦ Εὐφράτου*). It is obvious that these localities describe more the general extent of the country than its real limits, since Palestine itself is strictly not even included in them, and must be supplied from the enumeration of the tribes in ver. 23. Similar specifications of the boundaries were given already before in Gen. xv. 18, and were repeated later in Josh. i. 4. It is known, that these promises were only realized under David; and that the Israelites remained but for a short period in possession of so extensive a territory (compare 1 Kings v. 1—5).—David had already conquered Damascus (2 Sam. viii. 6) and subjected Syria; but Solomon possessed Eziongeber and Elath on the Red Sea (1 Chron. ix. 26; 2 Chron. viii. 17), fortified Hamath Zobah (probably Epiphania), built Tadmor, that is, Palmyra in the desert (2 Chron. viii.); his dominions extended even from Thiphsah on the Euphrates (Thapsacus) to Gaza (1 Kings iv. 24; compare *Raumer*, Palest. p. 23).—*Thou shalt expel them* (וגרשתמו); the Sept., Vulg., and Arab. Versions express here the first person: *I shall expel them*, as in vers. 29, 30.

32, 33. So extremely anxious is the divine legislator for the exclusive and pure worship of God, that with judicious prudence, he forbids the Israelites, not only not to suffer the idols (ver. 24), nor to admit any association with them (ver. 32), but even to enter into any alliance with heathen nations, or to suffer

כד 1 וְאֶל־מֹשֶׁה אָמַר עֲלֵה אֶל־יְהוָה אַתָּה וְאַהֲרֹן נָדָב וַאֲבִיהוּא

CHAPTER XXIV.

SUMMARY.—After God had commanded Moses, again to approach the mountain accompanied by Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel, and then to ascend it alone (vers. 12), he went down, communicated to the people all the laws "of the Book of the Covenant" (from xx. 19 to xxiii. 33); wrote them down; erected an altar and twelve pillars; offered holocausts and eucharistic sacrifices; sprinkled one part of the blood on the altar, and the other part on the people; read to them the Book of the Covenant, the stipulations of which they unanimously promised to observe (ver. 3—8). Then he went with his companions to the mountain; and all see, without danger, the appearance of God (vers. 9, 10, 11). Moses, then, on the repeated command of God, ascends the mountain, accompanied by Joshua, whilst the others remain behind to judge the people in their absence. Clouds covered the top of the mountain; six days Moses stood before it to prepare himself for his renewed communion with God; on the seventh day the Lord called him into the clouds, where he stayed forty days and forty nights in the divine presence (ver. 12—18).—On the farther connection of this chapter, see on ver. 1.

1. To the fundamental laws, at the conclusion of the preceding chapter (ver. 20—33), the rewards had been added which would attend their faithful fulfilment, and thus the Book of the Covenant, with all its doctrines and conditions, was perfectly completed. Before any new progress in the specification of the divine laws can be made, the ratification of the covenant between God and Israel is now logically inserted. Not only were these recent revelations clearly written down by Moses, and an altar and twelve pillars erected according to the number of the twelve tribes (ver. 4); not only did the people willingly promise faithful obedience to these divine commands (vers. 3, 7); but sacrifices are killed, and their blood—the blood of the covenant—was sprinkled on the people (vers. 5, 6, 8).

out from before thee. 32. Thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor with their gods. 33. They shall not dwell in thy land, lest they make thee sin against me, [1]if thou serve their gods, for it will surely be a snare to thee.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—For if......it will.

them in their country, lest they should seduce them to serve their gods, and thus prove to them a snare of destruction: a precaution, which the whole later history of Israel proclaims as wise and indispensable. Compare Num. xxv. 1, 2. But we refer expressly to our notes on xxii. 20, from which it will appear, how little Moses intended an absolute and unconditional separation from all foreigners, and how admirably he, in this difficult point also, combined expediency and humanity. "A covenant is made with the gods, if they are honoured with divine veneration, and if in return their assistance is expected," observes Rosenmüller; but even the toleration of idols in the country is a kind of friendly union, tacitly admitting a certain legitimacy of their existence; and, in fact, a league with the heathens involves a covenant with the gods also, since the pagans will naturally enter that compact under the condition only, that their gods be suffered and respected. Compare on ver. 24.—Nachmanides takes the first כי to the first part of the sentence; and then the following כי signifies *for*. This is certainly a simple and clear explanation. But others translate: "*when* thou servest their gods, it will *surely* be a snare to thee." It is true, that the Masoretic signs are in favour of this conception, which is also defended by Mendelssohn and others.

CHAP. XXIV. 1. And He said to Moses, Come up to the Lord, thou, and Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy

We must pause one moment at this important event. The whole history of Abraham and his descendants aimed and tended to this point. It was not sufficient that a *personal* covenant was, by God, concluded with that patriarch; that that covenant was renewed, on an enlarged basis, with Jacob as the representative of a *family*; and that it was, by the paschal rites, extended to a *national* convention. Mere political existence was not the only boon which God intended to bestow on Israel; He had decreed to select it as *His* people, as that nation which should worship Him as their eternal King. Liberty was the smallest portion of the divine favour towards Israel; Truth unfailing and beatifying crowned that independence; the blessing was not temporal, but spiritual; God promised to be ever near His people; and Israel pledged itself never to be faithless to its God. A higher climax in the internal connection between God and Israel was impossible; and the covenant related in these verses is, therefore, the last which the Old Testament specifies.

The connection of our chapter, which has been much disputed, is simply this: After the communication of the decalogue, Moses had again ascended the mountain (xx. 18); here God revealed to him the laws of the Book of the Covenant, from xx. 19 to xxiii. 33, whilst the people stood afar off (xx. 18); and, before He dismissed him, He ordered him to communicate these laws to the people, and then to appear again, with Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel (xxiv. 1), but so that he alone should really ascend the mountain, whilst the others and the people should remain at a distance (ver. 2). And so Moses did; he went down, and imparted to the people

וְשִׁבְעִים מִזִּקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתֶם מֵרָחֹק׃ 2 וְנִגַּשׁ מֹשֶׁה לְבַדּוֹ
אֶל־יְהוָה וְהֵם לֹא יִגָּשׁוּ וְהָעָם לֹא יַעֲלוּ עִמּוֹ׃ 3 וַיָּבֹא מֹשֶׁה
וַיְסַפֵּר לָעָם אֵת כָּל־דִּבְרֵי יְהוָה וְאֵת כָּל־הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים וַיַּעַן כָּל־הָעָם
קוֹל אֶחָד וַיֹּאמְרוּ כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּר יְהוָה נַעֲשֶׂה׃ 4 וַיִּכְתֹּב

all the laws of God (ver. 3), and, after having ratified the covenant by a sacrifice, he went, with Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and the seventy elders, to the mountain (ver. 9); but God commanded that Moses alone, accompanied by Joshua, should go up (vers. 12, 13), whilst the others should await his return at the foot of the mountain (ver. 14). After six days of preparation, during which the glory of God covered the mountain in clouds, God called Moses to Himself; he ascended the mountain entirely, and remained in the clouds during forty days and forty nights (compare also on xix. 25). Thus all difficulties which have been found in the context disappear, and we only remark: 1. The first part of our verse is thus to be supplied: "And God said to Moses: Descend, communicate my laws to the people, and then come up again, with Aaron," etc., similar to xix. 24: לך רד ועלית. Thus supplies also Rashbam: "And to Moses alone God said, when he was about to descend: 'Come up to the Lord *to-morrow*, thou, and Aaron,' etc.... and then Moses descended forthwith, and told the people all the words of God." And similarly Ebn Ezra. Rosenmüller: "*ascende*, nempe postquam superiora jura populo proposueris et fœderis inter Deum populumque icti ritus celebraveris." 2. That God speaks of Himself in the third person (עלה אל יי'), as in many other passages, as xix. 21; xx. 7, *et seq.* 3. The transition from the addressed second person into the third (in ver. 2, ונגש משה and עמו) is also frequent, as, in fact, the use of the pronoun instead of the substantive is not yet quite general in the Pentateuch (see on ver. 2). 4. The first and second verses contain the conclusion of the divine communication to Moses after the decalogue, so that xx. 19 to xxiv. 2 belong closely together. 5. The expression, ויעל משה וכ', in ver. 9, is not to be taken: *they went up the mountain*; for then אל־ההר would have been added, as in vers. 13, 15, or ההרה, as in ver. 12; and the repeated command of God, that Moses shall come to Him on the mountain (ver. 12) would be superfluous; but it signifies only: *they went* TO *the mountain*, as עלה denotes any direction to a more elevated place; from the foot of the mountain they saw the divine apparition; there they were to await the return of Moses (ver. 14), and to consume the sacrifices (ver. 11), whilst the people remained at a distance (xx. 15). Quite so the phrase עלה בהר is used in xix. 13; see the note there. 6. Joshua, as the servant of Moses, accompanied him up the mountain, without, however, entering with him into the cloud, which symbolized the presence of God (vers. 13, 16, 18). It is, therefore, perfectly inappropriate to take, with Philippson, the verb אמר as pluperfect, and to consider the contents of verses 1 and 2 only as a repetition of xx. 15—18: "And God had spoken to Moses," so that the whole revelation, from xx. 19 to xxiii. 33, would lie between the second and third verse. Such violent dismemberments are absolutely against the harmonious simplicity of the Biblical narrative. Rashi, following some Talmudists, supposes even that the events of this chapter (to ver. 11) happened before the promulgation of the decalogue (the fourth of Nisan), and ought, therefore, to have been inserted before the twentieth chapter. But against this opinion Nachmanides has already forcibly observed, that, before the revelation, the expression, "*Book of the Covenant*" (ver. 7), would be unintelligible,

of the elders of Israel; and prostrate yourselves from afar. 2. And Moses alone shall come near the Lord: but they shall not come near; neither shall the people go up with him.

3. And Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments, and all the people answered *with* one voice, All the words which the Lord hath said will

as it is impossible to understand thereby the seven laws of Noah, or the precepts given in Marah, or the contents of the Book of Genesis, which were at that time universally known, and needed, therefore, no new solemn ratification. Even Targum Jonathan adds in the text, that this communication to Moses took place on the seventh of Sivan, that is, on the day *after* the revelation. This is indubitably the correct view, which has likewise been adopted by several modern expositors. Compare also *Ranke*, Untersuchungen ii. p. 54—56. To אמר is, of course, *God* to be supplied as subject, not, with Targum Jonathan, "Michael, the prince of wisdom," nor, with the Talmud (Sanh. 38 *b*), the *Metatron* (see on xxiii. 20), nor, with Rashbam, *angels*. The Hebrew text mentions only the two eldest sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, as those who accompanied Moses; but the Samaritan codex adds here, and in ver. 9, from vi. 23, the two younger brothers, Eleazer and Ithamar. The seventy elders, here mentioned, are not that council, endowed with higher authority and filled with the divine spirit, which was later instituted (Num. xi. 16, 17) on the command of God; but they are the representatives of the Israelites, who shall, in their name, convince themselves of the truthfulness of the revelations of Moses by the sight of the divine majesty (vers. 10, 11).—About the elders in Egypt, and in the desert, see notes to iii. 16 and xviii. 21. And, since neither priests nor Levites, but elders from all the tribes, were chosen to witness that grand apparition, the priestly dignity of the whole people was again obvious (xix. 6). — *And prostrate yourselves from afar.* The elders came only to the foot of the mountain, but did not ascend the mountain itself. Geddes and Rosenmüller conjecture that the elders ascended only the northern lower mount, Horeb, whereas Moses proceeded to the southern higher top of the Sinai. But such a difference is nowhere alluded to in our text; and if we admitted it, it would certainly be more appropriate to suppose, that the elders waited on the plain, formed by the separation of the two peaks after their elevation from a common base, on which at present the convent of Elijah stands (see p. 63). Compare xx. 15.

2. Ramban observes to the words, *And Moses alone shall come up*: "The context required here the use of the proper noun (Moses) instead of a pronoun; because the words of God were also addressed to Aaron, who heard likewise the voice of God." But according to xx. 18, Moses was alone with God, without Aaron; in ver. 1, also, God addresses Moses alone, so that the second person ונגשת would have involved no obscurity. See *supra* on ver. 1, No. 3. The instances, which Ebn Ezra here adduces, are rather applicable to the irregular construction of the first verse: "Come up *to the Lord*" instead of *to me*. Compare xx. 18.

3. Moses descends from the mountain and reports to the people the legislation (xx. 19 to xxiii. 33); they promise ready obedience (ver. 7), as in xix. 8. The unanimity, with which the Israelites here pledge themselves to the divine worship, partakes of the sublime, and we willingly forget for a moment, how little they remained faithful to this promise, even in the time immediately following.

4. Ratification of the covenant, ver.

מֹשֶׁה אֵת כָּל־דִּבְרֵי יְהוָה וַיַּשְׁכֵּם בַּבֹּקֶר וַיִּבֶן מִזְבֵּחַ תַּחַת הָהָר
וּשְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה מַצֵּבָה לִשְׁנֵים עָשָׂר שִׁבְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ 5 וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶת־
נַעֲרֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיַּעֲלוּ עֹלֹת וַיִּזְבְּחוּ זְבָחִים שְׁלָמִים לַיהוָה פָּרִים׃
6 וַיִּקַּח מֹשֶׁה חֲצִי הַדָּם וַיָּשֶׂם בָּאַגָּנֹת וַחֲצִי הַדָּם זָרַק עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ׃
7 וַיִּקַּח סֵפֶר הַבְּרִית וַיִּקְרָא בְּאָזְנֵי הָעָם וַיֹּאמְרוּ כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּר
יְהוָה נַעֲשֶׂה וְנִשְׁמָע׃ 8 וַיִּקַּח מֹשֶׁה אֶת־הַדָּם וַיִּזְרֹק עַל־הָעָם וַיֹּאמֶר
הִנֵּה דַם־הַבְּרִית אֲשֶׁר כָּרַת יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם עַל כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה׃
9 וַיַּעַל מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן נָדָב וַאֲבִיהוּא וְשִׁבְעִים מִזִּקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃
10 וַיִּרְאוּ אֵת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְתַחַת רַגְלָיו כְּמַעֲשֵׂה לִבְנַת הַסַּפִּיר

4—8. The altar is for God; the twelve pillars for Israel. A similar covenant by stones is mentioned in Gen. xxxi. 46. Compare Josh. iv. 8, 20.

5. About the sacrifices and the "young men of the children of Israel," see notes to xviii. 12 and xix. 22. That common meals attended the conclusion of alliances from very early times appears from Gen. xxxi. 54; but this custom is here only the accidental basis; it is raised into a sacred action; the meals are converted into sacrifices. Targum Onkelos and Jonathan translate נערי by בוכרי, first-born; so also Rashbam.—In זבחים שלמים the latter is an apposition to the former: sacrifices, namely, eucharistic sacrifices. See *Ges.*, Gr. § 111. 1; *Ewald*, Gr. § 502.

6. אַגָּן laver, basin, bowl, in which the blood of sacrifice-animals was received; Arabic, اجانة. One half of the blood was sprinkled on the altar consecrated to God, the other half on the Israelites (compare Gen. xv. 10). "And hence our doctors inferred, that our forefathers entered into the covenant by circumcision, and baptism, and sprinkling of blood; for there is no sprinkling without baptism" (*Rashi*, after Kerithuth 19. About baptism see p. 433).

7. See ver. 3.—We take here and in ver. 8, עם not as the elders, but the people literally, as is quite clear from ver. 3; the ratification was not to proceed from the representatives, but from the mouth of the whole nation itself.

8. Targum Onkelos and Jonathan translate the words: ויזרק על־העם "he sprinkled it on the altar, to expiate the people," and Abarbanel lets the blood be sprinkled on the pillars: but על העם cannot be interpreted in this sense.—*The blood of the covenant*, דם הברית, is the blood, by the shedding of which a league is sanctioned. But the meaning of this rite seems to have been, that as the blood of the sacrifice was shed and sprinkled to all directions: in a similar manner the blood of him, who would break the alliance, was to be shed. Clericus compares herewith an analogous ceremony prevalent among the Romans in concluding treaties. For the fecial priest, who ratified the treaty, spoke among others the following words, as Livy (i. 24) relates: "Hear, O Jupiter;...... that the Roman people will not, under any condition, first swerve from this treaty. If they first swerve by public concert, by wicked fraud; on that day do thou, O Jupiter, so strike the Roman people, as I shall here this day strike this beast; and do thou strike them so much the more, as thou art more able and more powerful, and the mightier and stronger

we do. 4. And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose up early in the morning, and built an altar under the mountain, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel. 5. And he sent the young men of the children of Israel, and they offered burnt-offerings and sacrificed thank-offerings *of* oxen to the Lord. 6. And Moses took half of the blood, and put *it* in basins; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar. 7. And he took the Book of the Covenant, and read before the ear of the people: and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient. 8. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled *it* on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you [1]on the condition of all these words.—9. Then went up Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel: 10. And they saw the God of Israel: and *there was* under His feet [2]like a work

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Concerning. [2] As it were a paved work of a sapphire stone.

thou art." Compare *Rosenm.* ad hunc loc.—Similarly Iliad iii. 298—301, the spilling of wine is symbolized:

Ζεῦ κύδιστε, μέγιστε, καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι,
Ὁππότεροι πρότεροι ὑπὲρ ὅρκια πημήνειαν
Ὧδέ σφ' ἐγκέφαλος χαμάδις ῥέοι, ὡς ὅδε οἶνος,
Αὐτῶν καὶ τεκέων, κ. τ. λ.

"Hear, mighty Jove! and hear ye gods on high!
And may their blood, who first the league confound,
Shed like this wine, disdain the thirsty ground," etc.
(*Pope's Translation*).

על כל וכ׳ on *the condition* of all these words.

9. They went to the mountain (see on ver. 1).—It has been found surprising, that Joshua is here omitted, although, as is evident from ver. 13, he ascended with Moses; and it has been answered that Joshua was present neither in the name of the people nor for his own sake, but only as the attendant of Moses ready to execute the orders of the latter, or that he was among the seventy elders, and needed, therefore, not to be mentioned separately.

10. They saw the Lord, and under His feet it was like a work לבנת הספיר. לִבְנַת is stat. constr. of לִבְנָה splendour, pellucidity, not of לְבֵנָה brick (as the Sept. renders *πλίνθου*); and ספיר is our genuine sapphire, sky-blue, and harder than ruby. The sapphire of the ancients, probably the dark-blue not transparent lapis lazuli, lazure-stone, is neither appropriate in Job xxviii. 16—since it is not very precious—nor in Exod. xxviii. 18, as it was, according to Pliny, not applicable for sculptural purposes. It was, then, under the feet of the Lord "*like a work of pellucid sapphire*, such as the heaven can ever be seen in its utmost clearness and serenity," or as Targum Jerusalem paraphrases: "like a sky cleared from clouds." Onkelos, striving to avoid all anthropomorphistic expressions with reference to

וּכְעֶצֶם הַשָּׁמַיִם לָטֹהַר׃ 11 וְאֶל־אֲצִילֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא שָׁלַח יָדוֹ
וַיֶּחֱזוּ אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאכְלוּ וַיִּשְׁתּוּ׃ ס 12 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה
אֶל־מֹשֶׁה עֲלֵה אֵלַי הָהָרָה וֶהְיֵה־שָׁם וְאֶתְּנָה לְךָ אֶת־לֻחֹת הָאֶבֶן
וְהַתּוֹרָה וְהַמִּצְוָה אֲשֶׁר כָּתַבְתִּי לְהוֹרֹתָם׃ 13 וַיָּקָם מֹשֶׁה וִיהוֹשֻׁעַ
מְשָׁרְתוֹ וַיַּעַל מֹשֶׁה אֶל־הַר הָאֱלֹהִים׃ 14 וְאֶל־הַזְּקֵנִים אָמַר שְׁבוּ־
לָנוּ בָזֶה עַד אֲשֶׁר־נָשׁוּב אֲלֵיכֶם וְהִנֵּה אַהֲרֹן וְחוּר עִמָּכֶם מִי־בַעַל
דְּבָרִים יִגַּשׁ אֲלֵהֶם׃ 15 וַיַּעַל מֹשֶׁה אֶל־הָהָר וַיְכַס הֶעָנָן אֶת־
הָהָר׃ מפטיר 16 וַיִּשְׁכֹּן כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה עַל־הַר סִינַי וַיְכַסֵּהוּ
הֶעָנָן שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים וַיִּקְרָא אֶל־מֹשֶׁה בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מִתּוֹךְ הֶעָנָן׃
17 וּמַרְאֵה כְּבוֹד יְהוָה כְּאֵשׁ אֹכֶלֶת בְּרֹאשׁ הָהָר לְעֵינֵי בְּנֵי

God, translates: "And they saw the majesty of the God of Israel, and beneath it His majestic throne," and the Sept.: "they saw the place where God stood."—עצם השמים is *heaven itself*, according to the most frequent signification of עֶצֶם; the greatest part of the translations give indistinct conjectures: Onkelos כמחזי; and Jonathan כתקוף שפר; Septuagint *ὥσπερ εἶδος στερεώματος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*; Vulgate omits it; Luther "Gestalt"; English Version "body"; Mendelssohn "Farbe," etc. About the meaning of ויראו in our verse, and ויחזו in the following, Maimonides (Moreh i. 4) remarks: "In all these passages the verbs ראה and חזה must be understood as a reflection in the *mind*, but in no way as a real perceiving with the *eye*; for the eyes can only see corporeal things, and besides some qualities as the corporeal form and the like."

11. Although the elders (אצילים) saw God in His glory, He did not punish them (לא שלח ידו, see Gen. xxii. 12); they remained uninjured, according to the popular belief, that nobody can see God and live (see note on iii. 5).—אציל noble, as in Arabic اصيل, and thus translates Onkelos: רברבי; Saadiah, leaders. Others, those to whom the spirit of God had been imparted (like נאצל).—The words ולא שלח ידו, simple as they are, have been very differently interpreted. We adduce only Abarbanel's explanation: "the other elders (except the seventy) did not become participant of the divine vision"; and that of Rosenmüller (Orient ii. p. 88—90), who refers this expression to the custom of Oriental princes, to touch very respected persons with their hands, and to nod to others only slightly. Both expositions are arbitrary and against the spirit of our text.—*They saw God and did eat and drink*; they continued the sacrificial meal of the Covenant with cheerful confidence; for the עלות were sacrificed entirely, but the שלמים were consumed. Rabbi Jehuda Halevi, quoted by Ebn Ezra, remarks: "Although the elders had been permitted to behold the divine glory, they required physical food; and this is expressly mentioned, in order to show the superiority of Moses, who stayed on the mountain forty days and forty nights without eating or drinking."—Onkelos thus paraphrases our verse: "And the princes of the children of Israel suffered no injury, although they had seen the glory of the Lord; and they were as

of pellucid sapphire, and [1]like heaven itself in its clearness. 11. And upon the nobles of the children of Israel He laid not His hand: so they saw God, and did eat and drink.—12. And the Lord said to Moses, Come up to me to the mountain, and be there: and I will give thee the tables of stone, [2]namely, the law and commandments, which I have written [3]to teach them. 13. And Moses rose up, and his minister Joshua: and Moses went up to the mountain of God. 14. And to the elders he said, Remain here for us, until we return to you: and, behold, Aaron and Hur *are* with you: if any man has any cause, let him come to them. 15. And Moses went up to the mountain, and the cloud covered the mountain. 16. And the glory of the Lord dwelt upon Mount Sinai, and the cloud covered it six days: and the seventh day He called to Moses out of the midst of the cloud. [17. And the sight of the glory of the Lord *was* like devouring fire on the top of the mountain in the eyes of the children of

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—As it were the body of heaven. [2] And. [3] That thou mayest teach them.

rejoiced at their sacrifices, which had been favourably accepted, as if they had eaten and drunk": in which the latter part especially is freely rendered. The Septuagint translates thus vaguely: *καὶ τῶν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ οὐ διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἷς καὶ ὤφθησαν* [ויחזו] *ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ* [compare ver. 10] *καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἔπιον.*

12. About the connection, see on ver. 1. —*Which I have written.* According to Saadiah these words refer only to the "tables of stone," not to "the law and commandments," for God wrote only the decalogue Himself. And Ebn Ezra observes, that תורה denotes the first and fifth commandments, מצוה the remaining eight. This distinction also is superfluous; both words apply synonymously to the decalogue; God promises to Moses the tables of stone containing the precepts and doctrines, which He had written thereon; for the words והתורה והמצוה are an apposition to לחת; and thus the Sept. seems to have understood it, not translating והתורה, but התורה; so also Mendelssohn.

13 About Joshua, see note to ver. 9. Compare Rashi and Ebn Ezra on this verse; see also note on xvii. 9.

14. נשוב *we return*, namely, I and Joshua.—About Chur (חור) see note on xvii. 10. מי־בעל דברים, "whosoever has a law-suit;" דבר cause, see xviii. 26. The judicial disputes were naturally decided in the camp, not at the foot of the mountain, which was sacred; therefore, the sense of our verse is: return to the camp; but if you come back to meet us, do not proceed farther than to this place.

16. *And the cloud covered it*, namely, the mountain; not Moses, who was only six days later called into the cloud (compare ver. 18).

17. About the appearance of God in fire, see note on iii. 2.—Whether אש אכלת means just *destructive* lightnings,

יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ 18 וַיָּבֹא מֹשֶׁה בְּתוֹךְ הֶעָנָן וַיַּעַל אֶל־הָהָר וַיְהִי מֹשֶׁה
בָּהָר אַרְבָּעִים יוֹם וְאַרְבָּעִים לָיְלָה׃ פ

is uncertain, as אכלת may be a mere *epitheton ornans*.—This verse is of parenthetical signification; for ver. 18 belongs immediately to ver. 16.

CHAPTER XXV.

Introduction.

The outlines of the divine legislation have been revealed to the redeemed people (xx.—xxiii); a solemn covenant has been concluded on the basis of those fundamental laws (xxiv. 5—8); the immediate end of the deliverance from Egypt is attained. But an abstract delineation of a metaphysical religious system was not only insufficient for the mental condition of the Israelites, but would have offered very doubtful guarantees for a permanent observance. Now, pure and unadulterated monotheism was the corner-stone of the new religious edifice erected by Moses; it is so much its distinguishing feature, that the first tablet of the decalogue seems to aim exclusively at the injunction of that doctrine (see p. 340). It was therefore necessary, above all other considerations, to create a firm and visible centre of monotheism, to keep perpetually the idea of the one omnipotent God alive in the minds of the people, and so to exclude for ever a relapse into the pagan and idolatrous aberrations. Thus the erection of a holy portable tent as the abode of the Almighty, during Israel's wanderings, is commanded; God promises henceforth to dwell among His people, and to commune with His chosen servant, not from the cloud-covered mountain-peak, but from that visible place consecrated to His sanctity (xxix. 42—45; compare xv. 17). The elaborate detail with which the holy Tabernacle and all its various vessels are described, suffices alone to convince us of the great importance which the legislator attaches to these precepts; and, as most of the parts of which the sacred structure was composed have a significant symbolical meaning illustrative of the spiritual connection between God and Israel, it is not only important but highly interesting to obtain a clear and comprehensive picture thereof, both in its totality, and in its chief parts, by which the exposition and understanding of the next chapters will be materially facilitated and shortened.

THE HOLY TABERNACLE.

(בית, אהל, משכן, אהל מועד, אהל העדות, מקדש, and קדש; Septuagint, Σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου; *Philo*, ἱερὸν φορητόν; *Josephus*, ναὸς μεταφερόμενος καὶ συμπερινοστῶν, etc. About the signification of these names see infra, iii. 2).

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE TABERNACLE.

It consisted of three distinct parts; the *Holy of Holies*, *the Sanctuary*, and *the Court*. The two former constituted *the Tabernacle* (משכן), in its stricter sense, and were, at least externally, combined into one continuous structure. It was thirty cubits long (אמה), ten cubits broad, and as many cubits high, and formed therefore an oblong square; the longer sides were those which extended from east to west (xxvi. 18, 20). It was made of *boards of acacia wood* (עצי שטים), plated with gold, each of which was ten cubits long and one cubit and a half broad. The longer sides consisted therefore of twenty such boards, whilst the shorter (western) sides were to contain eight boards (xxvi. 25). But the latter would not cover a breadth of ten, but of twelve cubits. It is therefore added, that "six boards should be made for the side westward, and other

Israel.] 18. And Moses went into the cloud, and ascended up into the mountain: and Moses was in the mountain forty days and forty nights.

18. See xxxiv. 28: "And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread nor drink water." Compare Deut. ix. 9.

---

two for the corners of the Tabernacle, in the two sides they shall be double (תאמם), beneath and above and at the two corners" (vers. 22—24). From this obscure passage, it appears, in our opinion, that each board was half a cubit thick, so that six boards at the western side would completely close the tent from within (nine cubits added to the one half cubit at each side, being the thickness of the boards at the northern and southern wall); one half cubit breadth is double at each corner, and one cubit stands over at each side, for a purpose which will presently be obvious. We reject, therefore, all the various conjectures proposed to reconcile those two passages. The objections of Baehr (Symbol. i. p. 58—59) against the thickness of one half cubit for the boards are of little weight. Now the boards, in order to be fixed in the ground, were individually provided at the end with two symmetrically placed *tenons* (ידות משלבת), each of which fitted into a *socket* of silver (אדני כסף), resembling, according to Josephus, the sharp end of a spear, so that the longer side of the tent had forty tenons and forty sockets; and the shorter sixteen tenons and sixteen sockets.

But only the northern, southern and western sides were in this way framed from wood. At the eastern side was the entrance, which was covered with a *curtain* (מסך; Septuagint, ἐπίσπαστρον), of blue (תכלת), red (ארגמן), and crimson (תולעת שני), and twined byssus (שש משזר), into which figures were embroidered (מעשה רקם). This curtain, which formed of course a square of ten cubits, was supported by five pillars of acacia wood overlaid with gold, fixed by means of golden hooks, and five sockets of brass. The curtain was fastened to the pillars by golden *nails* (ווים).

The fifth side, or the ceiling of the Tabernacle, consisted of a costly covering composed of ten carpets or *curtains* (יריעת), of twined byssus, and blue, red, and crimson, with figures of the Cherubim interwoven (מעשה חשב). The length of each curtain was eight-and-twenty cubits; the breadth, four cubits; so that they covered a space of 1,120 square cubits. Five and five curtains were joined together; at the edge of the inner side of each of these two joined curtains, fifty purple *loops* (ללאת) were fastened, and these two rows of loops were joined by means of fifty golden hooks or *taches* (קרסים).

It is the common opinion that this splendid covering of exquisite texture was like the other three coverings, which we shall describe, spread over the wooden frame so as to hang outside the boards. But, if this were the case, only 300 square cubits of that rich texture would have been visible at the ceiling of the tent, whilst the remaining 820, together with the images of the holy Cherubim represented thereon, would have been concealed by the following much inferior coverings, and thus nearly three-fourths of the costly stuffs, and the excellent workmanship would have been wasted. Besides, the sacred text seems clearly to distinguish this covering as that of the *Tabernacle* (משכן), from the others, as those of the *tent* OVER *the Tabernacle* (לאהל על המשכן), compare xxvi. 1 and 7, 6, and 11; xl. 18, 19. Therefore Vater already (Pent. ii. p. 110) has thrown out the conjecture, that the first covering was suspended by small hooks within the boards, so that the inside of the Tabernacle was entirely covered with it. And this supposition has been raised to a certainty by the conclusive arguments with which Baehr (Symbol. i. p. 63—65) has supported it, and which Friederich (Symbol. p. 13) has in vain endeavoured to invalidate. Now as those curtains were

twenty-eight cubits long, they covered, if spread over the breadth of the Tabernacle, the whole extent, except one cubit at each end (for to cover it *entirely* 10+10+10 cubits would have been required; compare *Josephus*, Antiq. III. vi. 4: ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ὅσον πῆχυν ἀπέχοντα); and, as they were four cubits broad, the first five covered two-thirds of the tent (from the east, see *infra*), whilst one half of the remaining five was hung over the last third, and the other over the boards of the western side.

Then a covering of *goats' hair* (יריעת עזים) was spread outside over the Tabernacle. It was composed of eleven curtains, each thirty cubits long, and four cubits broad; six of these were joined together, and so also the other five; then these two pieces were fastened, like the internal covering, by means of loops and hooks; but the latter were of brass instead of gold. As the boards were half a cubit thick, these curtains also did not reach entirely to the ground, but half a cubit of the gilded boards remained uncovered on the northern and southern side; but not so at the western wall. For, in xxvi. 12, it is stated, that "the half curtain which remains of the curtains of the tent shall hang over the back-side of the Tabernacle"; and in ver. 13, "that a cubit on the one side, and a cubit on the other side of that which remains in the length of the curtains, shall hang over the two sides of the Tabernacle." We must, therefore, suppose, that the loops and hooks lay the breadth of half a curtain (two cubits) more westward from those of the inner curtain; now, as the thickness of the double boards of the western side was one cubit, and of those of the eastern side, together with the pillars, on which the curtain was fastened, likewise one cubit; it follows, that there was one cubit overhanging at the eastern side over the gate, and one cubit at the western side, on the ground. According to Josephus (*loc. cit.*), that additional cubit was rolled up and used to serve as an ornamental elevation, or a kind of cornice (ἀέτωμα) over the gate.

Over this covering was a third of *rams' skins*, dyed red, and a fourth of *badgers' skins* (xxvi. 14), both of which were not only spread over the roof, but hang down at the sides as a protection against the injurious influences of the weather. But as the Tabernacle was to be carried by the Israelites during all their wanderings in the desert (whence it is called by *Philo* ἱερὸν φορητόν, a portable sanctuary), five golden rings (טבעות) were fastened at the outside of the boards of the three sides, and poles of acacia wood, covered with gold, were, like bars (בריחים), transversely passed through them. The "middle pole in the midst of the boards reached from end to end" (xxvi. 28); the other four were probably so arranged that two together reached over the whole side, so that, in all, three full bars were on each side. Thus the whole framework received, naturally, a greater consistency and compactness. If we add hereto, that the coverings were fastened to the ground by means of tent-pins of brass (יתדות), and, most probably, by cords, we have completed the delineation of the external framework of the Tabernacle.

But this structure was divided into two parts of a different degree of sanctity, by a splendid curtain, adorned with the images of the Cherubim (פרכת or פרכת המסך), and suspended immediately under the loops and hooks of the first covering, so that the western part was ten, and the eastern twenty cubits long. The former is the Holy of Holies; the latter, the Sanctuary. This curtain also hung like that of the whole Tabernacle, on pillars of gilt acacia wood, but they were only four in number, fixed by means of hooks of gold and four sockets of silver. Golden nails were here likewise applied to fasten the curtain to the pillars.

A. THE HOLY OF HOLIES (קדש הקדשים; τὸ ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων, τὸ ἄδυτον) formed a perfect square, being ten cubits in length, and as many in breadth and height. The sacred furniture which it contained, was:

1. THE ARK (ארון) OR THE ARK OF THE COVENANT (ארון הברית; Septuagint, κιβωτὸς τῆς διαθήκης); also called "Ark of the Testimony," (ארון העדות; Sept., κιβωτὸς τοῦ μαρτυρίου; Vulgate, arca testimonii); or, the "Ark of the Lord"

(ארון יי׳, ארון אלהים). It was made of acacia wood, two cubits and a half long, one cubit and a half broad, and as high, plated with gold from within and from without. It had, therefore, the form of an oblong chest, probably provided with four small feet (see on xxv. 10—15). Round it was a border of pure gold, which encircled it like a crown (זר). Baehr (Symb. i. 377, 378) endeavoured to prove that this crown was fixed round the *middle* of the ark; but his arguments are partly weak, partly fallacious. For, 1. The etymology favours the usual acceptation quite as much as his interpretation, the corresponding Syriac word (זירא) signifying *a neck-chain;* and if, indeed, נזר, "crown," is kindred with זר, it is the more probable, that the ornamental wreath was at the upper, not at the middle part of the ark. 2. The word גג, in xxx. 3, is simply, "surface, top"; and includes, therefore, not necessarily another border. 3. It does not follow, from xxx. 4 and xxvii. 4, 5, that the זר of the altar of burnt-offerings was round its middle (see *infra*,); and even if so, this would prove nothing for other furnitures of smaller dimensions and very different construction.

For the purpose of transportation, the ark was provided with four rings at its four feet (פעמות), two on each side; two gilded staves (בדים, ἀναφορεῖς) of acacia wood were passed through them—perhaps, at the longer sides—and were never removed from them; probably, "that there might be no occasion to touch the holy vessel" (Abarbanel; compare 2 Sam. vi. 6; the words ושמו בדיו, in Num. iv. 6, are to be understood, "they *arranged* the staves or put them in order"; or, as Hebrew commentators believe, the rings were fitted into the incisions with which the staves were provided, to prevent their moving from their place and shaking the ark).

Into the ark, the two tables of the Law (שני לוחת אבנים, called also העדת, the Testimony) were put, and nothing more (see 1 Kings viii. 9). *Before* it, was placed an urn full of manna (see note to xvi. 33, לפני יי׳), and the blooming staff of Aaron (Num. xvii. 25, לפני העדות), and, at its side, the Book of the Law (Deut. xxxi. 26, מצד ארון). About the statement in Hebrews ix. 4, see *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. i. p. 202, note 2. Compare *Joseph.*, Antiq. III. vi. 5.

2. The Mercy-Seat (כפרת; Septuagint, ἱλαστήριον, or ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα; Vulgate, "propitiatorium"; Luther, "Gnadenstuhl") is one of the most important parts of the sacred implements; and the Holy of Holies is therefore called, in 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, *the house of the mercy-seat* (בית הכפרת). It was two cubits and a half long, and a cubit and a half broad (and, according to the Talmud, Succah 5, it was one hand-breadth thick); the former dimensions coincided, therefore, with those of the ark; but it was made of pure gold, not of acacia wood, and is thus distinctly different from the ark. It is, therefore, not merely the lid or cover of the ark, which, as we must necessarily suppose, had its proper cover of acacia wood; it is an independent and very momentous part of the Tabernacle; it is always enumerated as such, and not as a mere appendix to the ark; it is even more important than the ark itself (Lev. xvi. 2); and in xl. 20 it is distinctly stated, "that the כפרת was put on the ark *over it*" (מלמעלה). Ewald concludes, from the analogous forms of פרכת and כפרת, that the latter is a utensil in the strict sense of the word (signifying, *footstool*); but it is unnecessary to add, that this is a very inconclusive argument. The mistake has its origin in the circumstance, that the etymology of כפרת, from כפר, in its literal sense, *to cover*, has been too strictly urged. But anything which is placed on another object of equal dimensions covers it; and כפרת is, therefore, quite analogous to the Greek ἐπίθεμα, with which Josephus renders that word; but, as the blood of expiation was sprinkled thereon (Lev. xvi. 14), the Septuagint translate it appropriately, "expiating lid" (ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα; compare *Philo*, Vit. Mos. iii. p. 668), thus combining both significations; but, as the *meaning* of the כפרת was of such striking importance, the original sense of "cover" occurred gradually less obviously to the

mind, to which circumstance the meaning of כפר, in Piel, "to atone, to expiate," naturally contributed. In this manner we believe the difficulties of this question may be removed.

3. The Cherubim.—On the mercy-seat, and forming one whole with it (מן הכפרת xxv. 19), were two golden figures of the Cherubim, with their faces turned to each other, and looking down upon the *Capporeth*, and with their wings expanded over it. Their size is not stated, but they were probably not very large; neither is their form in any way described; they are mentioned as if they were objects generally known to the contemporaries of Moses. Jamieson accounts for this silence by the supposition, that the configuration of the Cherubs was, by tradition of the patriarchs, handed down from those which were placed before the Paradise to guard the access to the tree of life; whilst Kitto (Cyclopæd. of Bibl. Liter. i. 215, 216) believes, that it was known from Egyptian prototypes. If the latter opinion has at least some possibility, the former deserves scarcely any notice. Josephus (Antiq. III. vi. 5) remarks, that they resembled no animals that were ever seen by man, and that no man in his day knew their form (so also *Clem. Alex.*, Strom. v. p. 241). Ezekiel (i. 10) describes them as compound figures, with the heads of a man, an ox, a lion, and an eagle (representing reason, power, strength, and penetration; or, perhaps love, constancy, magnanimity, and sublimity), with four wings, two of which served to fly, two others to cover the body, and straight feet, without flexible joints at the knee. But, although the Cherubim had very different forms, so that they have not inappropriately been called, "changeable hieroglyphics"; and although the prophet might in his vision have beheld more complicated and adorned figures, mostly with four heads, but sometimes only with two (that of a man and a lion; xli. 18, 19): it appears from our context (xxv. 20), that those on the ark had but one face and two wings; and as they were intended to symbolize the divine presence (see *infra*), that face was most probably that of man, who is the image of God; and Ebn Ezra's assertion, that the Cherubim were winged men, is most likely essentially correct; and even in the descriptions of Ezekiel, however different they are from the Cherubim of the ark, the human figure is predominant (i. 5). The Rabbinical interpreters derive therefore כרוב from the Chaldee רביא or רוביא, boy; however, this etymology, like all others which have been proposed about this word, are most questionable; for instance, from כ like, רב, powerful; or from the Chaldee כרב to plough (=ox); or from רכב, to ride, etc. But winged figures are not peculiar to Egypt; they are most frequently found in the whole of western Asia, especially Babylon and Persia; and although they are mostly of a very phantastical form, there are yet some among them, which would nearly agree with the allusions made in our text (compare *Kitto, loc. cit.* p. 424, 425; cut 226, No. 1, 2; and cut 231, No. 4); and all of them have at least that characteristic in common with the Biblical Cherubim, that they have a purely symbolical character; so that even heathens could not suspect the holy Tabernacle of the Israelites to contain idolatrous images (see *Wilkinson*, Religion and Architect. of the Anc. Egypt. p. 275); unless Tacitus (Hist. v. 4) alludes to the Cherubim with the strange words: "effigiem animalis—of the ass—quo monstrante errorem sitimque depulerant, penetrali sacravere." Hengstenberg (Mos. and Egypt p. 157—164), who strives to prove almost in all Mosaic institutions an Egyptian model, asserts, like many earlier commentators, that the Cherubim are identical with the sphinxes; for, as the latter were a combination of the forms of a man and a lion, indicating the joint qualities of wisdom and strength, so had the former the head of a man and the body of a lion. But 1. he starts from the erroneous supposition, that among the ancient nations, with which the Hebrews came into contact, the Egyptians alone knew compound animals (p. 162); and 2. he asserts, that of the four heads of the Cherubim of Ezekiel, those of the man and the lion, are the principal ones; but the sphinx has only *one* head, the resemblance with the lion lies in the *body;* and therefore the Cherubim of Ezekiel can in no way

be compared with the sphinxes of Egypt. Others trace the Cherubim, with as little propriety, to the dragons of the Greeks, or the griffins of the Indians, or to the horses of the Greeks and Romans, which draw Jupiter's chariot; see especially on the latter parallel (proposed by *Michaelis*), *Herder*, Vom Geist der Ebr. Poesie i. p. 177—189; ii. p. 18, 19.—These are the implements of the Holy of Holies.

B. THE HOLY, OR THE SANCTUARY (הקדש) was twenty cubits long and ten cubits high; it was separated from the Holy of Holies by the costly curtain (פרכת) above described; and its entrance was at the eastern side, through another less magnificent curtain (מסך). The furniture of the sanctuary was:

1. The Shew-bread Table (שלחן הפנים, ש' הטהור, ἡ τράπεζα τῆς προθέσεως). It was made of acacia wood overlaid with gold, one cubit and a half high; its plate was two cubits long and one cubit broad. The latter rested on boards or lists, of one hand-breadth, which encircled the four feet like an *enclosure* (מסגרת; the translation of the Sept. στρεπτὸν κυμάτιον is inaccurate). The plate was, besides, like the ark, encircled at the border with a golden wreath or crown (זר, which was therefore, as Baehr asserts, beneath the מסגרת). Whether the enclosure had its own wreath of gold is not quite clear from xxv. 24, 25; but this is with probable reasons denied by several Rabbins (compare *Josephus*, Antiq. III. vi. 6; *Rashi* and *Ebn Ezra* on xxv. 25). The argument which Baumgarten (ii. 55) urges, that "the wreath to the enclosure" is preceded by the words: "and thou shalt make," which usually introduces a *new* utensil, is not conclusive, as that word is, in these descriptions, necessarily applied, and without such accessory signification. Baumgarten himself has some difficulty in finding a suitable place for the second wreath. Four golden rings were fastened in the four corners of the feet, probably immediately under the border or enclosure (לעמת המסגרת); and two staves of acacia wood, overlaid with gold, were put into the rings for the transport of the table in the journeys of the Hebrews.

On the table were placed as *shew-bread* (לחם פנים, ἄρτοι ἐνώπιοι, ἀ. τοῦ προςώπου), twelve (unleavened) cakes (חלות), in two rows of six cakes each (whence they are called לחם המערכת, Neh. x. 34, ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως or τῆς προςφορᾶς, and the table itself שלחן המערכת, 2 Chron. xxix. 18). They were made of the finest flour (סלת), each of them containing two omers, or two-tenths of an ephah (see note to xvi. 36); according to Jewish tradition, they were ten hand-breadths long, five broad, and one finger thick (*Talm.*, Menach. 96 *a.*; for the רקיקים, Lev. ii. 4, are thinner than the חלות). On each row pure *frankincense* (לבנה זכה) was burnt, either on the cakes themselves, or in two vials placed on the rows, as a symbol that the shew-bread was offered and sanctified to God (ללחם לאזכרה אשה ליי'). They were always on the table; but every Sabbath they were taken off, replaced by new ones, and eaten by the priests in the holy place (לחם קדש, ἄρτοι τοῦ θεοῦ; Lev. xxiv. 5—9; see, however, 1 Sam. xxi. 6—9).

The utensils belonging to the holy table were all of gold, namely, *a*) *the dishes* (קערות, Sept. τρυβλία, Vulg. acetabula, דפוסין), in which the bread was brought upon the table and taken away from it. They were rather flat (*Pollux*, Onomast. x. 23). *b*) *The bowls* (כפות, properly hollow vessels, Sept. θυΐσκαι), probably for carrying the frankincense, which was to be burnt over the bread (בזיכי לבנה, see Lev. xxiv. 7). *c*. *The cans* and *cups* (קשות and מנקיות, Sept. σπονδεῖα and κύαθοι), most probably for pouring out the wine (אשר יסך בהן) for the libations connected with the burning of the frankincense; and although the wine is not mentioned in our text, both those words (אשר יסך בהן), and the analogy with similar offerings (מנחות), render it indubitable, that it was used in the service of the holy table (see Numb. iv. 7), although it might not have been of equal importance with the bread, from which reason it is, like the frankincense, not mentioned in xxv. 23—30. Jewish tradition takes the קשות as "half tubes" (חצאי קנים), three of which were placed between each bread, in order to allow the air to pass through, and the מנקיות as four poles

fastened in the ground and provided with incisions, in which those tubes rested. But the Talmud itself is not decided in maintaining this interpretation (Menach. 97 *a.*), which finds no support in the Biblical text.

2. The Candlestick (מנרה, Sept. ἡ λυχνία) occupied the southern (or south-western) part of the Sanctuary, opposite the table. It was entirely of gold, and weighed, together with its appendages, one talent (ככר) of that metal (see note on xxi. 32). It was manufactured with beaten work, hardened by the hammer (מקשה; Vulgate, "opus ductile"; not of *solid gold*, opposed to *hollow* work; nor *turned* work, as Gesenius, De Wette, Rosenmüller, and others, explain). It rested on a *base* (ירך), the form of which is not described in the sacred text. Rashi conjectures that it had the shape of a chest, with three feet under it; the representation on the triumphal arch of Titus, which contains figures of birds and marine monsters, is undoubtedly spurious. From the base arose a *shaft* (קנה), which divided itself into three *branches* (קנים) to both sides, so that the candelabrum consisted of seven arms. On each of them was put a lamp (נר) of an uncertain shape, which was every evening filled with half a log (לג) of pure olive oil, and lighted (xxvii. 20, 21; xxx. 7, 8; Lev. xxiv. 2, 3; see *infra*), and extinguished in the morning, except, perhaps, the central lamp (called נר מערבי), which burnt from evening to evening; or, according to Josephus, three lamps burnt in the day-time. From xxv. 37, it appears that the wick of the middle lamp stood upwards, whilst the wicks of the six branch-lamps were turned towards it; so that the seven lights appeared to form a whole; and, in fact, the shaft was called "the candlestick" (xxv. 35). The dimensions of the shaft and of the branches are alike unknown to us; Jewish writers fix the height at eighteen palms or three cubits, and the breadth, that is, the distance between the two extreme lamps, at two cubits; according to Baehr, both the height and the breadth were one cubit and a half, proportionate with the dimensions of the table and the altar of incense. Josephus calls the arms of the candlestick "thin" (λεπτούς; so Kimchi, Ebn Ezra, and others); they were most likely of unequal length, and semi-circular form, so that the seven lamps stood in a straight line. Whether the candelabrum was placed so that the lamps extended from west to east, or from north to south, must remain undecided. Josephus (Antiq. III. vii. 7) states, that "the lamps looked to the east and to the south, the candlestick being situate obliquely."

The arms of the candelabrum were ornamented: *a*) *With calyxes of almond-flowers* (גביעים משקדים), three on each stem, and four on the shaft, one at each point, from which the arms branched out, and the fourth most probably immediately beneath the lamp, or, according to Rashi, exactly above the base; twenty-two in all; *b*) with *apples* or *pomegranates* (כפתרים; Septuagint, σφαιρωτῆρες; Vulgate, "sphærulæ"; Josephus, σφαίρια or ῥοΐσκοι; Rashi, תפוחים); they are certainly ornaments of a spherical form, similar to the capitals of columns—the usual signification of כפתרים—although it is impossible to define their exact shape; and *c*) with *blossoms* (פרחים) of pomegranates (?) or lilies (Septuagint, Josephus, Maimonides), or almonds (compare Num. xvii. 23); but it is very hazardous to fix upon any particular flower, since the Hebrew word is the general term for blossom or bud. It is the opinion of many expositors, that each calyx had its apple and its blossom; and that those three ornaments together formed a whole, of which, however, the calyxes formed the chief part. But it appears more probable, from ver. 33, compared with ver. 34, that every three calyxes were accompanied by one apple and one blossom, except on the shaft, where the fourth calyx seems to have had its own apple and blossom.

The Oil to be used for the candlestick is described as "olive-oil, pure beaten" (שמן זית זך כתית). The olive-tree, extensively cultivated and highly esteemed by ancient nations, formed one of the most precious productions of Palestine, and one of its most lucrative articles of export. It was chiefly grown on sand-hills and mountains, but thrives also on a moist soil, and even under water. Although it is of very

slow growth, it is said to attain an age of from sixteen hundred to two thousand years. It reaches a height of twenty to thirty feet; it has a smooth grey rind; its far-spreading branches cover almost the whole length of the stem to the top; the leaves, which are in pairs, have a lanceolate shape, are thick and stiff, almost without peduncles, about two and a half inches long, and of a dull evergreen on the upper, and hoary on the under surface. Between the leaves, white blossoms break forth in clusters; and the "fruit is an elliptical drupe, with a hard stony kernel, and remarkable from the outer fleshy part being that in which much oil is lodged, and not, as is usual, in the almond of the seed." The berry is first green, and assumes, later, a purple and black colour. It ripens in September. The best kind of oil is obtained from the unripe green olives, which are carefully plucked or shaken off, and then merely squeezed or beaten in a mortar. This is the שמן זית כתית, which was prescribed for the holy service; it is of a white colour ("oleum omphacium," Plin. xii. 60; also called שמן רענן, Psa. xcii. 11); it gives a better light and little smoke, and is much superior to the other sorts, obtained from the ripe olives by treading them out with the feet (דרך, Mic. vi. 15), or by throwing them into oil-presses (קוטב), or oil-mills (molæ oleariæ), although the latter yielded a more abundant quantity. It was natural, that the holy oil was to be pure, and unmixed (זך) with oil of any other quality. See *Celsus*, Hierob. ii. 330; *Ugolini*, De Re Rustica Heb., Thes. xxix. cap. 7; *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. ii. p. 170—172.

To the candelabrum belong, as accessory utensils, *a*) the *snuffers* (מלקחים; less plausibly, Septuagint, ἐπαρυστήρ, the vessel with which the oil is poured into the lamps; and Onkelos, צבתהא, "tongs"); and *b*) *fire-shovels* (מחתות; Septuagint, ὑποθέματα, "snuff-dishes"; Vulgate, "vasa, ubi quæ emuncta, extinguantur").

3. The Altar of Incense, (מזבח הקטרת or מזבח המקטר or מזבח הזהב, θυσιαστήριον θυμιάματος). Between the shew-bread table and the candlestick, and before the curtain which separated the Sanctuary from the Holy of Holies (xxx. 6), stood the altar of incense. It was square, one cubit long, one cubit broad, and two cubits high, of acacia wood overlaid with pure gold, ornamented with a golden *wreath* (זר) round its top (גג), with *horns* (קרנות, *Josephus*, κεραροειδεῖς γωνίαι) of the same materials as the altar itself on which the blood of atonement was sprinkled by the High Priest, Lev. iv. 7 (whilst the rest of the blood was poured at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offerings), and with golden rings for the staves. No sacrifice of any kind was to be killed on this altar; pure incense only was to be burned on it by Aaron every morning, when he dressed the lamps, and every evening when he lighted them. About the different kinds of incense to be used for that purpose (נטף, שחלת, etc.) see note on xxx. 34—38.

c. THE COURT. Around the Tabernacle and its implements was a Court, one hundred cubits long, fifty cubits broad, and formed by pillars and curtains five cubits high. The pillars were of wood, not plated with metal, twenty on each of the longer sides, ten on the shorter ones. But as the pillars at the corners were counted double, their aggregate number amounted to fifty-six (not sixty) columns. Like those of the Tabernacle, they were, at the nether end, provided with *sockets* (אדנים), in this case, of brass (נחשת), but they were ornamented at the top with *capitals* (ראשים) overlaid with silver (xxxviii. 17), and had, besides, silver *hooks* (ווים), over which *rods* (חשוקים) of the same metal were laid, to connect the columns, and to support the hangings of the Court. These hangings were of fine twined linen (שש משזר), five cubits between every two pillars, but as the northern and southern side had each one hundred cubits, and as twenty-one pillars of the distance of five cubits would be required for one hundred cubits, we must suppose that five cubits of the hangings were taken up by foldings and by the thickness of the columns. The same was necessarily the case with the hangings of the western side.

The entrance into the Court was from the east, "that when the sun arose, it might

send its first rays upon it" (*Josephus*, Antiq. III. vi. 3). Here was, exactly in the middle, a door, twenty cubits wide, overhung with a curtain of the same materials and workmanship as that before the Sanctuary, so that from each side of this entrance a space of fifteen cubits was left. The curtain was supported by four columns, and the hangings on each side of it by three pillars. We must here again suppose that the curtain was so folded that it occupied twenty cubits of stuff between the four columns, whilst the fifteen cubits of hanging at each side rested on their three columns *and* the extreme pillar of the curtain.

The Court had no covering, but was exposed to the open air. From without it was, like the Tabernacle, fastened in the ground by brass pins (יתדות) and tent ropes (מיתרים).

The sacred text does not state in which part of the Court the Tabernacle stood, but the most probable opinion is that of Philo (De Vit. Mos. iii. p. 668), who asserts that the Tabernacle stood twenty cubits distant from the north, south, and west side of the Court (not in its middle, as Josephus states), so that fifty cubits remained as the space between the eastern side of the Tabernacle and the entrance of the tent. This latter space was occupied by two holy implements, namely:

1. The Altar of Burnt-offerings (מזבח העלה). It was of hollow boards (נבוב לחת, xxvii. 8) of acacia wood, covered with brass, but probably, except during the journeys, filled with earth (see xx. 24; compare *Rashi* on xxvii. 5), which formed, at the same time, the upper side, or surface, on which the sacrifices were performed. Its height was three cubits, but both its length and breadth were five cubits. At the four corners were four horns of the same wood, overlaid with brass, on which a part of the blood of the sin-offering was sprinkled by the priest (xxix. 12), and by which, perhaps, the sacrificial animals were fastened to the altar before they were killed (Psalm cxviii. 27). Instead of the wreath (זר) round the ark, and the altar of incense, this altar had a *border* (כרכב), and under it a *grate of network of brass* (מכבר מעשה רשת נחשת), according to some, to serve as a kind of bench or step for the officiating priests; according to others, more probably in order to receive whatever might fall from the altar, and, as the network might have been very close, coals or wood were caught by it, and ashes only fell through. The network reached downward from the border to the middle of the altar (xxvii. 5). Baehr, Rosenmüller, Winer, and others, are of opinion, that the *border* was round the middle of the altar, and that the network covered its lower half to the ground. But, 1st. the clear statement of the text militates against it: "And thou shalt put it—the network—under the border of the altar beneath, that the net may go to the middle of the altar" (ver. 5); and, 2nd. the obvious analogy between the "wreath" (זר) of the altar of incense, and the border of our altar, compels us to suppose the latter to have been also at the top and not in the middle. On the network, at the four corners of the altar, were four rings of brass, into which two staves of acacia wood, overlaid with brass, were put for transport. From the ground to the top of the altar, led, as many assert, a kind of gentle sloping dam of earth, according to Rabbinical tradition, on the south side (see, however, on xx. 23).

The vessels used in connection with this altar, were all of brass, namely: *a. pots* (סירות), to remove the ashes (לדשנו; not "pans to receive the ashes," as the English Version translates); *b. shovels* (יעים), to clean the surface of the altar; *c. bowls*, or, *basins* (מזרקות), in which the blood of the sacrifices was received for sprinkling the altar; *d. forks*, or, *fleshhooks* (מזלגות), by means of which the pieces of flesh were put or turned on the fire; and, *e. fire-shovels* (מחתות).

2. The Laver (כיור, λουτήρ, labrum, xxx. 18—21; xxxviii. 8), in which the priests washed their hands and feet before they performed any of their sacred functions. It stood between the altar of burnt-offerings and the curtain of the Sanctuary, according to the Talmud (Midd. iii. 6), a little to the south. It was made of brass; chiefly "of the looking-glasses of the women, who served at the door of the holy

tabernacle" (במראת הצבאות אשר צבאו פתח אהל מועד, xxxviii. 8). This interpretation, which has been attacked by Baehr, has been fully vindicated by *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. i. 460. The former renders: "he made the laver of brass.... *together with* looking-glasses for the women" etc. A very strange combination of utensils! Its form is not described in the text: but we may infer from the corresponding vessels of the temple of Solomon, that it was semicircular; and all ancient interpreters agree in this opinion. It is further supposed, that it was provided with small apertures or taps, through which water could conveniently be let out; for it is asserted, that the priests could not wash their feet in the laver itself, because it was too high, and because the water would have become impure and unavailable if but one priest had washed his feet therein. But we leave these, and other similar conjectures undecided, since they cannot be substantiated from the Biblical text. The laver rested on a brazen base (כן), the shape of which must likewise remain uncertain.

This is a brief outline of the Holy Tabernacle and its implements; in which sketch we have endeavoured to simplify the description as much as practicable, by studiously avoiding all polemical regard to unimportant accessories.—If we survey the sacred structure in its totality, we cannot discover any of its parts, which the Israelites should have been unable to execute, either from want of materials, or deficiency of skill; and the frequently repeated objections against the authenticity of the sacred description based on that argument, have been so successfully refuted by Baehr (Symb. i. 271—276; ii. 116—119), both as regards the character and proportions of the building, and the mechanical mode of its execution, that we consider it unnecessary to enter into a question so widely connected with researches foreign to our present subject (see *Vater*, Pent. iii. 658, *et seq.*; *De Wette*, Beiträge zur Einleit. ins A. T. i. 258; ii. 259; *Gramberg*, Chron. 179; *Bohlen*, Gen. Introd. p. 112; *Haevernick*, Einleit I. ii. 460, *et seq.*). And with these arguments, the arbitrary conjecture, that the Tabernacle is a fictitious structure, framed in smaller dimensions after the model of the Solomonic temple, loses the only weak basis on which it rested.

II. THE MATERIALS USED IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE TABERNACLE.

A. THE METALS mentioned in xxv. 3, are gold, silver, and brass; the application of iron was considered inappropriate in the construction of holy utensils (xx. 22).

1. Gold (זהב), almost everywhere qualified by the epithet *pure* (טהור), which is according to the Talmud such gold, as "loses nothing in the fire" (Abarb. מזקק שבעתים, "seven times purified"). Compare, about the different names and kinds of gold occurring in the Bible, *Rosenmüller*, Antiq. IV. i. p. 48, *et seq.*—In the Tabernacle it was used *a*) as a solid mass: for the hooks and nails of the pillars, and of the two inner curtains; the loops and hooks of the first covering, for the mercy-seat, the Cherubim, the rings and the wreaths of the ark, of the shew-bread table, and of the altar of incense; for the dishes, the bowls, cans, and cups; for the candlestick, with the snuffers and fire-shovels. *b*) As a covering of the acacia wood: for the boards and poles of the Tabernacle, the pillars of the two inner curtains; for the ark, the shew-bread table, and the altar of incense, with their staves, and the horns of the latter.

2. Silver (כסף), which is here not described by any epithet (see *Rosenmüller*, *loc. cit.* p. 53, *et seq.*). It was used *a*) as a solid mass for the sockets of the boards of the Tabernacle and of the pillars for the two internal curtains; the hooks and rods of the pillars of the Court; *b*) as a covering for the capitals of the Court pillars.

3. Brass (נחשת) was considered less precious than the two preceding metals, although it was of great durability, and had a shining colour. It was used *a*) as a solid mass for the sockets of the pillars of the middle curtain, the loops and hooks of the second covering, the tent pins of the Tabernacle and of the Court; the sockets of

the Court-pillars; the border, the net-work, and the rings of the altar of burnt-offerings; its pots, shovels, bowls, forks, and fire-shovels; the laver and its base. *b*) As a covering: for the sides of the altar of burnt-offering, its horns and staves.

Thus some idea might be formed of the quantity of metal employed in the sacred structure; and the holy text distinctly states the amount of each species, namely, 29 talents (כִּכָּר) and 730 *holy* shekels of gold, 100 talents and 1775 holy shekels of silver, and 70 talents and 1400 shekels of brass (xxxviii. 24, *et seq.*). About the value of the shekel and the talent, see note on xxi. 32. The hundred talents of silver were applied for the hundred sockets of the Tabernacle; and the 1775 shekels for the hooks, rods, and capitals of the pillars of the Court.—Many modern critics have considered this great quantity of precious metals as another argument against the authority of the Mosaic description of the Tabernacle; but the enormous, almost incredible abundance of gold and silver in the Orient, especially in former times, is so well known, that that objection must appear perfectly futile, and we content ourselves with referring to the interesting facts and data compiled by *Baehr*, Symb. i. p. 259, 260.

B. COLOURS enumerated in xxv. 4, 5.

1. Blue, or Violet-Blue (תְּכֵלֶת, Sept. ὑάκινθος or ὑακίνθινος, violacea purpurea), which is a dark colour playing partly into red, partly into blue—sea-blue; it was obtained from the juice of a shell-fish, mostly found in rocks and cliffs, called κῆρυξ, buccinum, murex or conchylium (or חִלָּזוֹן,—helix ianthina (?)—*Targum Jonathan* on Deut. xxxiii. 19, and *Talm.*, Menach. 44, not sepia loligo [Blackfish, Dintenfisch], or felis marina Hispanica [Spanische Seekatze], as Michaelis believes), It is of a spiral form, with a round opening (*Pliny*, Hist. Nat. ix. 61). However, the exact species of shell-fish, from which the ancients gained the purple, is still a subject of dispute. Such fish were abundantly found on the coasts of Phœnicia, Laconia, and North Africa; and are still of frequent occurrence throughout the whole of the Mediterranean and Atlantic; but the shells of the different coasts yield very different colours (see *Vitruv.*, De Archit. vii. 12). If the Phœnicians (Tyrians) are not the inventors of that colour, they were at least (like the Lydians) most celebrated for the skill which they exhibited in its application for dyeing. Woollen stuffs were especially dyed with it, but sometimes also linen and cotton. Modern observations have testified the fact, that the tinging juice is originally white, but upon being exposed to the sun becomes first light green, then deep and sea-green, and then only blue or red; but it has been remarked, that this circumstance does not appear entirely to agree with the purple of the ancients. As each shell-fish furnishes only a few drops of the tinging juice, called the flower, and contained in a white vessel in the neck, it was considered so precious, that only kings and princes, and the highest officials, wore purple garments, and that in the time of the Roman emperors, the citizens were interdicted, on penalty of death, from using that colour. Contravention of this law was regarded as crimen laesae majestatis (Cod. Just. xi. 8); and the murex itself was called *sacer* (compare Midrash ad Esther iii. 6).—In the Holy Tabernacle it was applied for the curtains before the Court, the Sanctuary, and the Holy of Holies, and for the first covering and its loops. Kimchi explains תְּכֵלֶת by *bleu;* or Italian, *azzurro oltra marino*, although it includes the darker colours also. But Abarbanel translates incorrectly *silk;* Ebn Ezra, Rashi, and others, *yellow* (ירוק), and Luther, *yellow silk*, others, *indigo;* compare *Talm.*, Sanh. 91; Jebam. 4; Menach. 44; *Maimon.*, Ziz. ii. 1 (but ὑάκινθος is not exclusively blue, as Baehr has endeavoured to establish with insufficient arguments); *Bochart*, Hieroz. iii. p. 665; *Braun*, De Vest. Sacerd. i. cap. 13; *Heeren*, Ideen I. ii. p. 97; *Gesen.*, Thes. p. 1503.

2. Red (אַרְגָּמָן, πορφύρα, purpura, in 2 Chron. ii. 6 אַרְגְּוָן, as in Chaldee and Arabic; about the etymology, see *Gesen.*, Thesaurus, p. 1263), is obtained from a shell-fish, which is caught in the sea by bait (and therefore called πορφύρα θαλασσία, 1 Macc. iv. 23). Pliny (ix. 60) describes it thus: "The second class of shell-fish is called

purpura, the mouth of which is projecting in a fistular form, and the inside of which has a tubular shape. It is, besides, furnished with prickles to the top, generally seven such stings standing on each spire, which are not found in the *buccinum*, but both have as many spires as they count years." Compare *Bochart, loc. cit.* p. 678; *Amati*, De Restitutione Purpurarum; *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. ii. p. 290, 291.—It was used for the same parts of the Tabernacle as the תכלת, except for the loops of the first covering.

3. Crimson (תולעת שני, or שני תולעת, or תולע, or שני and שנים; κόκκινον, φοινικοῦν—not δίβαφος, which means "double-dyed," from שנה, to repeat; vermiculus, coccus, coccinum, croceum (from תולעת, worm, and سنى, to shine), is that bright much-valued colour (χρῶμα ὀξύ, λαμπρόν; Targ. זהורי) which is obtained from the dead bodies and eggs of a small insect, the female of the *coccus ilicis* of Linnæus (תולעת; Arabic, *kermes*, crimson), which, towards the end of April, settles on the branches or leaves of the *holm-oak* (πρῖνος, κόκκος; ilex aquifolia, or coccifera; Stechpalme), and which is so diminutive, that the ancients considered it not as a living insect, but as a sort of grain, or small raisin, and as a vegetable production of the tree itself (cusculium, Plin.). "It is about the size and shape of a pea, of a deep violet colour, powdered with white," adhering to plants, chiefly oaks; in the spring, the females lay eggs; then the bodies decay, and form a cover which shields the eggs. The ilex aquifolia grows frequently in Asia Minor, Palestine, and in the southern parts of Europe; it attains the height of two or three feet, has oval, pointed, evergreen, bristly leaves, a grey smooth rind, and bears round scarlet-red berries in grape-like clusters (*Dioscorides*, Mater. Medic. iv. 48). The colour under discussion may, therefore, have been *vermillion* (worm-colour). The Phœnicians were again the nation which had brought the art of preparing and applying crimson to the highest perfection (Plin. ix. 65). Whether שני is synonymous with אדם, as Baehr believes, is uncertain; and although that colour, which fire and blood have in common, was chiefly called φοινικοῦν, it does certainly not follow, that אדם is identical with דם, blood (see *Maimonides*, ad Chilaim ix. 1; he calls our colour כרמן; Ebn Ezra ad xxv. 4; Kimchi explains both ארגמן and תולעת שני with crimson; Saadiah, only the latter word; Rashbam believes תולעת to signify, dyed wool, whilst שני qualifies it as *red* wool; but תולעת is no stuff, but a colour; *Rosenmüller*, Schol. II. i. p. 412—414). It was prescribed to be used for the curtains and hangings of the Tabernacle.

c. STUFFS AND OTHER MATERIALS. They are:

1. Linen (שש or שש משזר). This is, perhaps, the most contested of all the materials mentioned in connection with the sacred structure; but we may try to bring in harmony the great variety of conflicting or inaccurate opinions set forth in many a laborious treatise. There occur, in the original text of the Old Testament, five nouns of stuffs, the relative meaning of which is subject to much dispute: בד, פשתה, בוץ, שש and כרפס. It is the opinion of many, that the poverty of the Hebrew language precludes the possibility of possessing two names for the same object or notion; and that we are therefore compelled to seek five different stuffs in those five words. (So *Royle*, in Kitto's Cycl. ii. p. 752.) But that supposition, which denies at once all synonymous terms in the Hebrew language, is completely refuted and removed by the whole sacred poetry, which is, in a great measure, founded on synonymous parallelism (see p. 264); and, in fact, we meet, in vol. i. p. 773 of the same work, with the contrary assertion: "the simple manners of the ancient Semitic nations multiplied the names of the few objects they had constantly before their eyes." It is further but natural, that a product, which is imported from a foreign country, is adopted under the identical name with which the importers designate it; and if the same product is introduced by two or more different nations, it cannot surprise, if it bears two or more different names. Starting from these premises, we observe:

a. פשתה (פשת) is universally allowed to be *flax*, or *linen* garments manufactured

of flax (compare note to ix. 31). Gesenius (Thes. p. 1136) derives it from the Punic word Ζεραφοῖς, that is, זרע פש, "linseed."

b. The robes of the priests are promiscuously represented to consist of בד and of פשתים (compare especially Ezek. xliv. 17, and Exod. xxviii. 42); it is, therefore, evident, that בד also signifies *linen;* for linen was considered the purest of all materials for garments, for the sweat does not so easily settle in it (Ezek. *loc. cit.*); from this reason the priests of the Indians and Egyptians wore also, in the temples, exclusively, linen robes (*Herod.* ii. 37); and the same custom was adopted by the followers of Isis, when her service was introduced in Rome and Athens (*Plut.* Is. iii).

c. The root בד is obviously kindred with that of בוץ, *byssus*, and in Arabic there is, indeed, but one corresponding word (بز). The derivation of בוץ is of *Aramaic* origin, and is therefore chiefly used of the *Syrian* byssus (Ezek. xxvii. 16; see *Gesen.*, Thes. p. 190). According to Herodotus (iv. 86), the bands used for enveloping the mummies were *byssine sindon* (σινδόνος βυσσίνης τελαμῶσι); and numerous modern microscopic examinations have proved the mummy-cloths, even of the poorest individuals, to be *linen*. For the threads of linen have a cylindrical form, are transparent, and articulated or jointed like a cane; those of cotton have the appearance of a flat ribbon, with a hem or border at each edge. The threads of mummy-cloth have, on accurate observation, been found perfectly to exhibit the qualities of the former, without any mixture of the latter. It may, however, be admitted, that *later* writers used the word byssus to indicate cotton also.

d. We read, in Exod. xxxix. 28, distinctly: they made "the breeches of linen (מכנסי הבד) of שש משזר"; and hence it is clear, that שש is synonymous with בד, and signifies also linen or byssus. The etymology of בוץ and שש leads, indeed, to the same meaning; for בוץ (from باض, ابيض) and שש (from the *Egyptian* root, σχέντι), signify both, whiteness, splendour (and so is חור, white linen, Esth. i. 6, derived from a root of the same meaning); for the linen garments of the priests were indubitably white, which is the colour of purity and sanctity (compare Rev. xix. 8, 14, ἐνδεδυμένοι βύσσινον λευκὸν καθαρόν), although Pausanias (V. v. 2) describes the Hebrew byssus as yellow (ξανθή; but the byssus was most likely artificially blanched, as is the case with our linen). As the word שש is of Egyptian origin, it seems to have been chiefly used for Egyptian byssus (Ezek. xxvii. 7), although, in the later Biblical books, בוץ is mostly substituted for it.

From these remarks it results, that שש is synonymous with בד, פשתים and בוץ, and that it signifies *linen*, like these latter expressions. The Targumim translate sometimes שש, and sometimes פשתה, with בוץ; the Septuagint render בד both with βύσσινος and with λίνος; Philo calls the λίνη ἐσθῆς of the High-priest βύσσος ἡ καθαρωτάτη; Ebn Ezra explains, clearly: "שש is the same as בד, a certain kind of linen, which comes from Egypt alone"; and Rashi: שש הוא פשתן; similarly Abarbanel on xxv. 4. The difference which some Jewish interpreters establish between שש and בד is unimportant, as they consider both as *two sorts of linen*, different in their texture only. The word כרפס in Esth. i. 6, which is, perhaps, of *Persian* origin (كرباس, κάρπασος), is almost generally admitted to signify "linen cloth," and is mentioned by the classical writers as a product of Spain, but especially of the Orient. (See *Plin.*, Hist. Nat. xix. 1; Curt. viii. 9. Rosenmüller supposes that כרפס denotes the *green* colour of the "garden parsley;" كرفس, Apium Petroselinum; but admits that it signifies, in Sanscrit, linen garment).

We must, therefore, reject the opinions of those who translate שש by *silk* (Luther), or *cotton* (Rosenmüller, Winer, and others), or *fine wool* or *hemp* (Royle, who takes בד

as linen, פשתה as flax, and כרפס as cotton). Compare, on this subject, *Forster*, De Bysso Antiquorum p. 47, *et seq.*; *Braun*, Vestit. Sacerd. Hebr. I. vi. p. 90, *et seq.*; *Celsius*, Hierobot. ii. pp. 169 and 259; *Rosenm.*, Antiq. IV. i. p. 175, *et seq.*; *Yates*, Textrinum Antiquorum, p. 335; *Kitto*, Cycl. i. 472, *et seq.*

The country most renowned for the manufacture of linen was Egypt. Pliny and Athenæus ascribe the invention of the art of weaving to Egyptians. Some products of their loom were so remarkably fine, that they felt like silk, or resembled entirely the finest cambric or muslin, and were therefore called "woven air." The most remarkable feature in its manufacture is, that the number of threads in the warp exceeded that of the woof, often even by threads four times the quantity. The linen employed for enveloping the mummies was of a much coarser texture, especially that which was next to the body. Linen was likewise exclusively used for household purposes, for dresses, as for the coverings of chairs and couches. The textures had often coloured borders; in such cases, the colour was imparted to the threads previous to the fabrication of the cloth. The colouring matter of the *blue* stripes was generally indigo. (See *Wilkinson*, Manners iii. p. 114—127).

The noun שש is, in the Hebrew text, frequently combined with the epithet משזר, which is derived from שזר (Arabic, شزر), to twist a thread from right to left, or back-handed, and signifies, therefore, twisted of many threads (see *Ges.*, Thes. p. 1386), not net-like, or meshy, or sieve-like, as Rashi, Sundius, Witsius, and others, believe; for the garments of the priests were intended to cover the body entirely (xxviii. 42). Septuagint, βύσσος κεκλωσμένη; Vulgate, "byssus retorta." The art of twisting the thread was, in Egypt, practised in different methods, it is copiously represented on the tombs of Beni Hassan, and has been described by Rosellini (I. Monumenti II. ii. 13, *et seq.*).

2. Wool. If we read, that the hangings of the Tabernacle were to be made of "linen, and blue, and red, and crimson, with Cherubim of the weaver's work" (xxvi. 1), this is to be understood, that the principal or main substance was linen, but that *wool*, dyed with the costly colours enumerated, and worked into ornamental figures, was skilfully interwoven. And so in all similar passages. That wool was used for that purpose is, in itself, probable, considering the abundance of this material in the East, and its peculiar susceptibility for those shining colours, and it is expressly mentioned in Hebrews ix. 19 (ἔριον; compare Num. xix. 6). See *Braun*, De Vestit. Sacerd. p. 187. Compare *Maimonides*, ad Chilaim ix. 1.

3. Goats'-Hair Covering (עזים). The finest and softest hair (מנוצה, Rashi), probably of the Angora goat (not of the black Syrian, or brown Egyptian, breed), was manufactured into a beautiful, but solid substance, which was used for coverings of tents, and which is so strong, that it withstands even long and violent rain-showers; although this was, in the present case, scarcely necessary, as it was shielded by two other stronger coverings. The Septuagint renders correctly, τρίχας αἰγείας; Targum Onkelos, מעזי.

4. Rams' Skins dyed Red (ערת אילים מאדמים) formed the third covering of the Tabernacle. The rules of Hebrew grammar permit us to refer the adjective (מאדמים) to the first part of the compound substantive (ערת; see *Ewald*, Gr. § 570); and the Jewish interpreters also explain these words: "rams' skins dyed red" (see Rashi on xxv. 5, and our note there). But it is not inadmissible to understand, *skins of red rams*; and, if so, it would be the Ovis tragelaphus, which is thus described: The tragelaphus is a distinct species of sheep, having a shorter form than the common species, and incipient tear-pits. Its normal colour is *red*, from bright chesnut to rufous chocolate; which last is the cause of the epithet *purple* being given to it by poets. Far to the south, or within the tropics, the species is densely clothed with coarse short hair, but longer on the neck, and pendant in great abundance

beneath the throat. The skins were, perhaps, tanned, and coloured crimson (see *C. Hamilton Smith*, in Kitto's Cycl. ii. p. 600).

5. Badgers' Skins (עֹרֹת תְּחָשִׁים) were applied for the fourth and uppermost covering of the Tabernacle, and for wrapping up the ark and other holy implements during the journeys; they are besides mentioned in Ezek. xvi. 10, as the material from which ladies' shoes were made. This latter circumstance, combined with the fact, that תחש is frequently used in the plural, excludes the opinion of those, especially ancient interpreters, who understand it as a *colour*, although they differ widely in determining it (Sept. δέρματα ὑακίνθινα; Aq., Symm., ἰάνθινα; Jerom., pelles ianthinæ; Syr., Chald., between purple and scarlet, ססגונא; Arab., black; Oedman, dark blue; Rosenmüller and Hartman, red; Kitto, purple). But it is most difficult to decide, which animal is intended by תחש; and as we deem a minute disquisition into this subject here inadvisable, we content ourselves with merely specifying the various significations which have been assigned to that Hebrew term: badger (Gesenius, who has defended this meaning with strong arguments; and many others); jackal (θώς, *Gesner*, *Harenberg*); seal (phoca vitulina, *S. Rau*, *Faber*); boar (Persian Transl.); pardale (Gr. Ven.); weasel (חלא אילן, *Talmud*, see Sabbath 28, *b*.); fitchet, dolphin (*Niebuhr*); mermaid (trichechus manatus, *Michaelis*, *Hase*, *Büsching*, see *Rosenmüller*, Schol. I. ii. p. 416; *Oedmann*, Verm. Sam. iii. cap. 2), especially the species of dugong (*Rüppell*); tahesh, a kind of hyena (*Labrecht*); walrus (a polar animal); "a ruminant of the antelope family, known to the natives under various names, such as pacasse, empacasse, thacasse, facasse and tachaitze, all more or less varieties of the word tachash" (!) (*C. H. Smith*).—In such uncertainty, and considering that the question is, after all, of little importance, we adhere to the received translation of badger, which has, at least, as many reasons in its favour as any of the other numerous conjectures (see *Gesenius*, Thes. p. 1500). For the objection, that probably the skins of *clean* animals only were applied for the Tabernacle, does not appear of great weight, if we consider that this is the fourth quite external covering separated from the framework by two other coverings (see *Boch.*, Hieroz. i. 989; *Rosenm.*, Orient ii. p. 94; *De Wette*, Archaeol. p. 251, note *e*).

6. Acacia Wood (עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים, Arab. سنط, not cedar, compare Isaiah xli. 19, nor ebony, nor box, nor cypress) was the only wood employed in the whole structure of the Tabernacle. It grows very abundantly in Arabia Petraea, chiefly near the Sinai, so that even a locality there was called Shittim (Num. xxv. 1). There are especially two genera of this tree, the Acacia vera, which yields the gum-arabic, and which is described by Hasselquist (Trav. p. 514), and the Acacia Arabica, which is very similar to the former, but the blossoms of which are not fragrant like those of the Acacia vera. The wood of the Acacia is so durable, that it is said even not to rot in water, and that it is therefore called by the Sept. ξύλον ἄσηπτον (see *Pliny*, Hist. Nat. xiii. 19; *Joseph.*, Antiq. III. vi. 1, 5). It has, further, the quality of extreme lightness, which must have increased its value as a material for a *portable* tent (see *Jerome* on Isaiah xli. 19, and Joel iii. 18).

The usual *measure* mentioned in connection with the sacred structure is the *cubit* (אמה). The Hebrew word signifies originally *fore-arm*; and not in Hebrew alone are many measures derived from parts of the human body (compare טפח hand-breadth, or palm; אצבע finger-breadth, זרת span, xxviii. 16), but in many other languages are arm and ell expressed by the same word (for instance, πῆχυς, ulna, cubitus, etc.). This cubit comprised naturally the length from the elbow to the extremity of the longest finger (not merely to the root of the hand at the wrist; Ezek. xli. 8, is not decisive), and was generally considered to contain six palms or hand-breadths (ἑξαπάλαιστος), which was the length of the common Asiatic and Egyptian cubit (see *Herod.* ii. 149; compare Journal des Savans, 1822, p. 704), and

of that of the Romans (*Vitruv.*, iii. 1; compare *Talm.*, Menach. 97, *a. b.*). This is the cubit "by the fore-arm of a man" (באמת איש) mentioned in Deut. iii. 11 (so *Mishna*, Chelim xvii. 9; and *Joseph.*, Antiq. III. vi. 5: "a cubit is equal to two spans; a span is equal to three hand-breadths").—But it is further known, that the Babylonians used, besides, another "royal" cubit, which was by one palm longer than the common one (compare *Herod.* i. 178: ὁ δὲ βασιλήϊος πῆχυς τοῦ μετρίου ἐστὶ πήχεος μείζων τρισὶ δακτύλοισι); and it is, from two passages of the Scriptures, more than probable, that the Hebrews adopted in later periods that longer measure; namely, 1. from 2 Chron. iii. 3, where cubits "of the former length" (במדה הראשונה) are introduced; and 2. from Ezek. xl. 5, where we read of "six cubits באמה וטפח," of one cubit and a palm each. It is obvious, that these two cubits cannot be distinguished as "sacred and profane," as has been done after the analogy of the two kinds of the shekel (see note on xxi. 32). Nor can we see, that the supposition of Winer and others, that the Hebrews used in their common commercial intercourse a third, shorter cubit of five palms, has any foundation or probability, although a similar opinion has been advanced by Rabbinical writers also (see *Carpzov*, Apparat. ad Antiq. S. Cod. p. 676). Now, according to the accurate calculations of Boeckh, Bertheau, and Thenius, the cubit of six palms contains 0·483,90 French millimeter, or 214·512 Parisian lines. About *hand-breadths* (טפח) see note on xxv. 25.

It is well known, that among many other nations of antiquity also holy arks or shrines were employed for religious purposes; among the Egyptians (*Plut.*, de Isid. xxxix.), the Trojans (*Pausan.*, vii. 19), Greeks (*Theokrit.*, Idyll. xxvi.), Romans (*Catull.*, De Nupt. Pel.), Etruscans (*Euseb.*, Praep. Ev. ii. 3), Northern Germans (*Tacit.*, German. xl., or the goddess Hertha), Mexicans, and even among the tribes of the islands of the South Sea (*Rosenm.*, Orient ii. 96—103). Most of the modern critics have, therefore, with great assurance pointed to these shrines, especially those of the Egyptians as the models of the Mosaic ark. But although the external forms of both are not so entirely different, as Baehr believes them to be (see the representations in Déscript. de l'Egypt., map i. pl. 11, fig. 4; pl. 12, fig. 3; iii. pl. 22, 34, 36; and *Kitto*, Cyclopædia i. p. 216, 217; we see in almost all of them winged human figures, corresponding with the Cherubim, in some a wreath (זר), and in some a cover like the Capporeth): it is unquestionable, that their respective contents and purposes were diametrically opposed; for whilst the Hebrew ark was destined as the receptacle of the holiest religious and moral truths of Mosaism, the Greek and Egyptian shrines contained only symbols of begetting and conceiving, or of the most material powers of physical nature (see *supra*, p. 42). If therefore, there be any historical connection between the Egyptian shrines and the Mosaic ark, it is here, as in all similar cases (perhaps also as regards the shew-bread table, the candle-stick, the altar of incense, and the laver), not that of servile and blind imitation, but that of refining and spiritualizing: paganism adapts all religious ceremonies to cosmical, Mosaism to purely ethical purposes. "All these arks," says Rosenmüller, "had, like that of the Hebrews, the aim to render the mysterious objects preserved therein more venerable to the people." But the essential object is that which is *contained* in the ark, not the ark itself; unless we maintain, that the religion of the Egyptians was identical with that of the Hebrews, because both worshipped in temples.

III. THE SYMBOLICAL MEANING OF THE TABERNACLE.

Two extreme opinions have been proposed on this question; the one distinguished by its great simplicity, the other characterised by an extraordinary degree of sagacious combination; and whilst the former has been shared by many, especially modern Biblical enquirers, the latter has obtained in K. W. F. Baehr a most ingenious, learned, and persevering champion. It is expedient, briefly to examine the relative value of these two opposite systems :—

1. "The whole structure of the Tabernacle," observes Winer (Bibl. Dict. ii. p. 531), "has undoubtedly been designed after the religious and Levitical requirements, and is simply based upon the ordinary construction of tents. The Oriental tents have usually two divisions; their interior is illumined by a lamp; the back compartment is prohibited to strangers, and was therefore, as the adytum in the Holy Tabernacle, particularly appropriate for the reception of the mysterious ark. For the offering of burnt-sacrifices an open court, capacious enough to receive the worshippers, was necessary. The wood, of which the frame-work was manufactured, is the only one which offered itself in the desert; the adornments with precious metals, and the costly curtains and hangings, are easily accountable from the desire of devoting to the Deity the most valuable part of property, and of furnishing the sanctuary with the greatest possible dignity; even the colours of the first covering are perhaps merely chosen because they were at that time generally employed for similar splendid structures" (see also *Munk*, Palest. p. 154).—But this opinion will satisfy but few. If the Tabernacle was, indeed, nothing but a copy of a common Oriental tent, with no ulterior end or higher meaning, it is impossible to account for the unusually detailed description of the holy text; for the circumstance, that God "showed Moses the pattern of the Tabernacle, and the pattern of all the implements thereof" (xxv. 9); and for the almost literal repetition of the same description, when the execution of the structure is related (from chap. xxxvi.). If the candelabrum was merely the usual tent-lamp, serving to no other purpose but to illumine the interior, why was it necessary, so minutely to prescribe its shaft, its arms and its ornaments? What does the mercy-seat mean, and what the Cherubim—the altar of incense and the shew-bread table? The Orientals are distinguished by a rich, even luxurious imagination, which lends life, meaning and significance to those objects even, which seem only to appeal to the calm reflective faculties; they attribute to all things, which engage their attention, a higher spiritual meaning; they are apt to symbolize. It is, therefore, unquestionable, that those who adhere to that opinion just quoted, see *too little* in the construction and arrangement of the Mosaic Tabernacle. For whilst the external appearance of the structure was imposing enough to inspire the common mass of the people with feelings of religious reverence and awe, those of superior minds and deeper intellects found in its parts and composition inexhaustible materials for the most fertile reflections, and for an ennobling insight into the attributes of the divine Ruler, and His relation to the chosen people.

2. It is not quite so easy to dispose of the second opinion above alluded to. But we should deem this part of our work incomplete and deficient, if we did not try to offer a succinct exposition and criticism of Baehr's views. He judiciously and appropriately takes his starting-point from the names with which the Tabernacle is designated in the sacred text, and shows: *a.* that אהל, בית and משכן, are equivalent terms, signifying house or habitation. But here already he makes an incomprehensible leap in his argumentation; for he asserts, "the structure which God has erected, the house in which God lives, is—*the creation of heaven and earth.*" However, we read distinctly in xxix. 44, the reason, why the Tabernacle was called "the house of God"; for "I will dwell (ושכנתי) in the midst of the children of Israel, and will be their God." It is singularly illogical to suppose, that God commanded the erection of a visible dwelling-place among the people of Israel, and that this dwelling-place should yet be nothing else but heaven and earth, which are themselves visible objects, and required no allegorical representation. But this is the foundation of Baehr's whole symbolical system, which, as he himself confesses, is not substantiated by a single passage of the Old Testament; and as that principal idea is erroneous, it must necessarily lead to very fallacious interpretations, if applied to the individual parts of the Tabernacle. And, in fact, we meet with artificial symbolization at almost every step. On the one hand, he maintains, that the ground represents the earth; the roof or covering signifies

the heavens—the pillars are the mountains, which support the heavens (i. p. 77); whilst he asserts, on the other hand, that the Tabernacle itself is an image of heaven, and the Court an emblem of the earth (p. 79); and it is this latter conception, which he especially carries out and advocates. But if the Tabernacle signifies the heavens, what does the decided distinction between the Sanctuary and the Holy of Holies mean? (see *infra*).

b. אהל מועד, "Tabernacle of meeting" (from יעד, to appoint) signifies the place, where God meets and addresses Moses and the people; it is *not* originally intended as a place of assembly for the Israelites, although this might have been the natural consequence of its primary destination (The rendering of the English version, "Tabernacle of the congregation," is, therefore, incorrect. See xxv. 22; xxix. 42—45; xxx. 6; Num. xvii. 19).

c. אהל העדות, "Tabernacle of the testimony" (from עדות, witness), is properly so called, from the most important and sacred object preserved therein, the decalogue (which is called עדות, because it is a "witness" of the Covenant between God and Israel; see note on xvi. 32—34; compare xxv. 21; Num. ix. 15). However, although the roots יעד and עוד are cognate, the two appellations of אהל מועד and אהל העדות are not synonymous; between the place, where God appears to Moses or Israel, and the ark, where the tablets of the Law are preserved, we see no necessary internal connection; they are two different names of the Tabernacle, derived from two different purposes, which that structure was destined to serve; although that place was the most appropriate for future revelations, in which the result of the first and greatest of all revelations was deposited. And not only in this point does Baehr go too far, but still much more in his attempt to prove, from xxix. 45, that ידע belongs to the same family of words; for, says he (p. 82), "meeting involves a witnessing [?], and witnessing and revealing are nothing but *making known*." The inaccurate ancient translations are no proof; they render here only the general sense. But the author does not stop there; carried away by his uncommon power of abstraction, he labours to prove, that the divine *creations* have the *word* for their first necessary form; that both are identical; and both combined constitute *revelation*, which is, besides, the unity of understanding and creating; for these two notions are, in his opinion, perfectly synonymous, and are but other terms for *light* and *life*, which are also equivalent. But the arguments which he offers in corroboration of these views are not altogether satisfactory; he asserts, that, in Hebrew, ידע, means both "to understand," and "to beget"; but, in all passages which he quotes, it is merely a euphemistic expression for sexual intercourse Gen. iv. 1, "Adam knew his wife Eve"; (see xix. 5; 1 Sam. i. 19); he further adduces, *testis*, *testari*, and *testiculæ*, as cognate words; and compares *gignere* with *cognoscere* (γιγνώσκειν). But all these are etymological argutiæ. We refrain from mentioning the other still less conclusive parallels which he adduces; and it appears scarcely necessary to comment on the final result at which he arrives: that the Tabernacle is, on the one hand, the image of creation or of general revelation, and, on the other hand, a symbol of the revelation by the word through the medium of the decalogue; it is the place of light and life; it is, in a word, the world and the creation, conceived as the testimony and revelation of God.

d. מקדש and קדש, "Sanctuary" is the name of the Tabernacle, because it was intended as the abode for God, the Holy One; and because He had promised to reveal Himself there to Moses and the people. But it is forced, to connect, by gradual, although almost imperceptible, transitions, the notion of sanctity with that of sanctification, purity, and salvation; so that the Tabernacle would be the place "where Israel, by its communion with God, obtains true salvation." The term מקדש, therefore, so far from being "the most specific and most characteristic" designation of the Tabernacle, is much less definite than אהל מועד or אהל העדות; and קדש is no

epithet exclusively used with respect to the Tabernacle, but employed for everything which has any, even the remotest, reference to the Deity or religion.

So, then, remains as the meaning of the Tabernacle, that it was an external but holy symbol of the presence of God among the Israelites (משכן), and the place from whence God promised to meet and to grant His future revelations to Moses and the people (אהל מועד), and where the decalogue, as the witness of the divine covenant, was preserved (אהל העדות).

Hence the meaning and purport of the different parts of the Tabernacle are self-evident. The *ark* contained the tablets of the Law, the germ and quintessence of all revelation, the most precious treasure of the holy people, the representative of the entire Law, the basis of Israel's whole existence; and the Most High himself, symbolized by the mysterious forms of the Cherubim, spread His protecting wings over that eternal inheritance of mankind. The *mercy-seat*—the most important emblem of the Holy of Holies—was the place for the expiation and sanctification of Israel, for the reconciliation of God with His people. The *Cherubim* represented, therefore, the presence of God, who promised to instruct Moses and the people from between (מבין) these holy figures; they were the emblem of the Hebrew theocracy; and God Himself is hence frequently called "He who throneth between the Cherubim" (1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2; etc.); and, like the Cherubim before the entrance of Paradise (Gen. iii. 24), they are, as a part of tbe ark, connected with the expiation of sin, and are the guardians of a divine and mysterious treasure. And, as the revelations of God took place from spirit to spirit, merely by the voice of the Eternal without a corporeal visible form, that part of the sacred structure which contained the symbols of divine presence and revelation was dark, neither illumined by the rays of the sun, nor by artificial light. The Holy of Holies was to impress the officiating High-priest with a feeling of supernatural awe and reverence. The *shew-breads* are a perpetual offering brought to God by the *people* of Israel (therefore, *twelve* cakes): the *table* was a necessary utensil for these offerings. The *candlestick*, in itself indispensable to illumine the dark, reminds of the eternal watching providence of God (נר תמיד), and of knowledge and enlightenment through the word of God (compare Isa. ii. 5; Psa. xxxvi. 10; etc.), which should never cease in Israel (Psa. lxxx. 16); and the *seven* arms point to the sacred, purely religious, spiritual character of the candlestick. The meaning of the *altars* and the *laver* requires no specification. The utensils of the Holy of Holies typify the descending of God to man; those of the Sanctuary and the Court, the rising up of man to God; and thus the whole structure admirably represents the mutual love of God and Israel. That the altar of burnt-offerings was the chief object of the holy tent is an untenable opinion; none of the names supports an assumption, according to which all the complicated utensils of the Sanctuary and of the Holy of Holies would be reduced to mere appendages of the altar of the Court. It is beyond every doubt, that the ark and the mercy-seat were the real end of the sacred structure; and hence their place in its most recondite part. All the implements of the Sanctuary and of the Court belonged only to the *service* of the Tabernacle, and sacrifices were offered before its erection also (xix. 12; xxiv. 5; compare *Nachmanides* on xxv. 1: (והנה עקר החפץ במשכן הוא מקום מנוחת השכינה שהוא הארון).

3. Baehr further finds a particular significance in all the numbers mentioned in connection with the Tabernacle and its materials; the fact, that ancient, especially Oriental, nations attached a high importance to certain numbers (i. 119—138) induces him to examine all the measures of the holy tent, and to expound their meaning. It will not be uninteresting to offer here, in a concise form, the results of his investigations, equally obtained by sagacity and learning.

The number *one*, being the first real number, and the head and source of the whole numerical system, may be considered as *the number by itself* (τὸ ἕν, ἡ μονάς), but serves chiefly to designate the Deity as the unity which comprises the universe.

Two is separation, difference, opposition, antagonism, imperfection, and even destruction and perdition; but, being the first equal number, it is the representative of every thing equal.

Three signifies that concrete and perfect unity resulting from the reconciliation of difference and opposition; it is the perfection of all ideas, and especially the "*signature of the Deity.*" "All the religious systems of the ancient world agree in representing the supreme Deity as a trinity of combined gods, forming one whole; and whilst this one primitive being is a mere abstract, neutral and impersonal, the divine impersonification appears always in the trinity, from which the other deities emanate." In this sense, the trinity was familiar to the Indians, Buddhists, Chinese, Chaldeans, and even to the Persians, Greeks, and almost all northern nations.

Four is the number of the *world*, the sum of all created things and of divine revelation.

Five is the number of perfection in its half-accomplished stage; it is not itself perfection, but strives to attain it.

About the number *seven* see note on xxiii. 10—12.

Ten is the symbol of completion and perfection ($1+2+3+4=10$).

Twelve (4×3) denotes a whole, in the midst of which God resides, a body, which moves after divine laws; it is therefore the "signature of the people of Israel."

It is neither the place here, to investigate into the probability and truth of these significations attributed to the various numbers, nor do we intend to follow Baehr into his minute, although very ingenious application of those symbols to the individual parts of the Tabernacle, or into his symbolical interpretation of the metals, colours, and other materials used in that holy structure. The metals, in his opinion, typify light, and more especially is *gold* the image of heavenly and divine light; *silver*, that of purity and moral excellence; brass resembles gold in colour, but is considerably inferior to it in splendour. Acacia wood is a symbol of indestructibility and eternity. And thus the Tabernacle is "the abode of light and life"; see *supra*. The colours are the symbols of the different names of God; *blue* (תכלת) signifies the special revelation of God (יהוה) being the colour of heaven and ether [but תכלת is not exclusively blue]; *red* (ארגמן) denotes the highest dignity, majesty and royal power (אלהים); *crimson*, (תלעת שני) is that, which fire and blood have in common, and symbolizes therefore life in its full extent (חי); *white* (שש), lastly, is the colour of light and innocence, or sanctity (הקדש). And so again is the Tabernacle the image of light and life. It must be admitted, that Baehr's combinations are generally most sagacious and skilful, that they are supported by an extraordinary amount of research, and that they mostly result in ideas perfectly in harmony with the spirit and genius of the sacred writings. But that author was not satisfied with general truths; he applied them to the minutest details of the Tabernacle; he carried the comparison between the ideas and their external representation to an excess often bordering on futile play; he lost himself in deductions more and more foreign to the original principles; and his labours, although carried on with the greatest intellectual vigour, have not produced those valuable results for science to which they might have led, had he known how to govern a too agile imagination. For an elaborate analysis of Baehr's opinions, we refer to *F. Friederick*, Symbolik der Mosaischen Stiftshütte; compare *Kurtz*, Stud. und Krit., 1844, p. 315; *De Wette*, Archaeol. §299; *Hengstenberg*, Auth. of the Pent. ii. 636, *et seq.*; *Keil*, Tempel Salom. p. 135; *Baumgarten*, Comment. I. ii. p. 51; *Munk*, Palestine, p. 150—154.

4. We conclude with briefly reviewing the principal other symbolical interpretations of the Tabernacle hitherto proposed:—

a. The oldest explanation of this kind is that of Philo (Vit. Mos. iii. p. 665—669). He believes, that the Tabernacle is a representation of the universe; the tent itself, which was only accessible to the priests, signifies the intellectual, the open Court, the

material world (τὰ νοητά and τὰ αἰσθητά); the four colours, or four covers, are the the four elements; the two Cherubim signify the two principal (the creative and ruling) powers of God, or the two hemispheres above and beneath the earth; the altar of incense is to recall the productions of the earth and the sea, which God mercifully brought forth for the use of man; the candlestick, with its seven lamps, typifies the seven planets; the middle lamp (that of the shaft) the sun; the table with the shew-bread signifies the human food; the twelve cakes denote also the twelve signs of the zodiac and the twelve months.—Very similar to this exposition of Philo is that of Josephus (Antiq. III. vii. 7, and vi. 4; compare Bell. Jud. VII. v. 5): the Court means the earth; the Sanctuary, the sea; the Holy of Holies, the heaven; and kindred ideas are expressed by Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. v. p. 562), Origen (Hom. ix. p. 164), Chrysostomus (Opp. ii. p. 793), Theodoret (Quaest. xl. in Exod), Jerome (Epist. 64), and many Rabbinical writers (Jalkut, fol. 113; *Aramah* on xxv. 10).—It will be perceived, that this is fundamentally the same view as that defended by Baehr, who however, justly deviates from it as regards the astronomical elements (the planets, zodiac, etc.), which have been brought into connection with the holy abode of God, and which would almost stamp upon it a pagan character. In fact, nothing is more in antagonism with the purely ideal and moral character of Mosaism than a relation, however distant or hidden, with the powers of the Kosmos. God and nature, the creation and the Creator, are everywhere so decidedly distinguished, that the most majestic descriptions of the glory of nature are invariably accompanied by some declaration, that all that grandeur proceeded from God, and is subject to His sovereign will (Ps. civ. etc.); and so deeply was this truth felt by the Psalmist, that he added, after a splendid picture of the glory and sublimity of nature, an almost still more enthusiastic praise of the Divine revelation and its beatifying influence upon the soul of man (Ps. xix; compare p. 185, 186).

b. Many Talmudical commentators, starting from the Scriptural statement, that Moses saw the model (תבנית, xxv. 40) of the Tabernacle during his stay on the mountain, assert, that the Tabernacle is really an imitation of a similar, although infinitely more grand structure in heaven; that a certain invisible connection exists between both (compare Sohar, fol. 91: כל מה די בארצא הכי נמי בעילא), and that everything which is performed in the earthly Tabernacle is at the same time done in a much higher perfection in its heavenly prototype, especially as regards expiation (see *Talm.*, Chag. c. 2). However, few only have understood this in quite a literal and material sense; by far the greater part of the Rabbins, spiritualizing these notions, maintained, that the Holy Tabernacle embodied, in earthly forms, certain divine and ideal truths, which were communicated to Moses during his mysterious communion with the Deity.

c. The typical or Christian explanation, proposed already by some Fathers of the Church, but more fully developed by Cocceius and his followers, enjoyed long a great reputation. According to this school, the Tabernacle is a type of the congregation or church of Christ, the Court represents the external or visible, the tent the internal or invisible church, namely, so that the Sanctuary is the symbol of the *ecclesia militans* and of the *status gratiae*, and the Holy of Holies that of the *ecclesia triumphans* and of the *status gloriae* (see *Witsius*, Misc. Sacr. lib. ii., diss. 1; *Sal. van Till*, De Tabernaculo Mosis). However, these views have long been abandoned even by the greater part of the orthodox Christian theologians, and we content ourselves with condensing the just objections urged against them: *α.* The Tabernacle, if conceived in this sense, loses all connection with, or application to, the time for which it was intended, and during which it existed. *β.* That interpretation leads to the most artificial, often ridiculous conclusions, if applied to the individual parts of the sacred text (for instance, the dissertation of J. F. Cramer: "Quadratus quomodo Christus fuerit"?). *γ.* The Tabernacle is no holy *person*, but the holy *place* of divine revelations (אהל מועד).

δ. The passages in the New Testament which are generally adduced in corroboration of this system (Ephes. ii. 21, 22; 1 Peter ii. 4; Hebr. ix.), contain no direct allusion to Christ or the Christian congregation, but only to the general and local character of the structure.

d. Maimonides (Moreh Neb. iii. 45—49), Spencer, Hess, Koeppen, and many modern antiquaries, consider the holy temple as a magnificent palace for the Almighty King of Israel; the priests are the ministers of the King, the sacrifices are demonstrations of loyalty, the shew-bread and the wine are His food, the mercy-seat is His throne, the sanctuary the ante-chamber for the officials, etc. This opinion has been combated by Baehr (i. p. 10—15, and 113—116) with particular sagacity and success. He proves that the veneration of the kings was copied from the worship of the deities, not *vice versa;* for the palaces were constructed like temples, not the temples like palaces. Moses saw the prototype (תבנית) of the Tabernacle, which would have been superfluous, if the latter was nothing but the usual tent of Oriental princes. If luxury and splendour were the chief consideration, why were many valuable offerings of the people refused? (xxxvi. 5—7). If it was intended as the palace of a mortal king, why is the couch or bed wanting? etc. However, it must be added, that Maimonides seems himself not to have been quite satisfied with this merely external, almost worldly explanation of the holy structure, and bending towards the right direction, he maintains likewise, that it represented certain fundamental truths of Mosaism, as, for instance, the ark proves the unity of God; the Cherubim, the existence of angels, etc.

e. Luther (Werke ed. Walch, vii. 1236) believes the Tabernacle to represent human nature; the Court signifies the body, the Sanctuary is the soul, the Holy of Holies the spirit. The same idea appears already in Philo's writings, and has been carefully elaborated by Friederich in the work above quoted. But this interpretation also completely loses sight of the immediate destination of the holy tent, and is, besides, especially in the anatomical and osteological deductions of Friederich, as artificial as the typical or the oldest cosmical symbolization (see *De Wette*, Archaeol. p. 300; *Baehr*, Ueber den Tempel Salom. p. 69, etc. About another partly typical, partly historical explanation of Kurtz, see *Hengstenberg*, Auth. of Pent. ii. p. 631).

f. We have already stated the general views of Baehr, and add here a short survey of the symbolical significations which he ascribes to the individual utensils. *The ark* occupied the exact centre of the Tabernacle [?], because the decalogue formed the centre and heart of the Mosaic Law; it was covered with gold not only from without but also from within, because the interior enclosed the greatest treasure of the people; the golden wreath denotes divine sanctification. The *mercy-seat* is the throne of the God of Israel, the central point of the Hebrew theocracy, the place of divine revelation, of forgiveness and redemption. The *Cherubim* represent the creation in its most perfect productions [which is questionable; his whole exposition on the Cherubim does not lean on the *Mosaic* figures, but those of Ezekiel, with their *four* faces instead of *one*, and on the generic expression חיות, used by the prophet, before he was able to describe, in the tenth chapter, the species more distinctly]; they stand in a stooping attitude, in humility and devotion looking upon the throne of God [?]; the mercy-seat and the Cherubim together signify omnipotence, sanctity and expiation. The ark is, in importance, subordinate to the mercy-seat, and stands to it in the relation of a foundation to the house erected upon it. The *shew-bread* is that bread through which God shows Himself, or by the eating of which the soul beholds God [certainly a very far-fetched opinion]; the *twelve* cakes correspond with the number of the tribes of Israel; they were unleavened, because every corruption and putrefaction were removed from the holy place; and the incense shows the heavenly transport of the soul which it feels in beholding God; the *shew-bread table* indicates that the means of satisfying the soul with the light of heaven are always in readiness in the divine abode [with

which interpretation disagree, however, passages such as xxxiii. 20: לא תוכל לראת את פני, "thou canst not see my face"]. The *light* of the candle-stick is the type of knowledge and intelligence, the seven-fold light makes this knowledge manifest as pure and holy; the *candle-stick* itself is the word of God [and Baehr applies this idea of the word of God to all the parts and ornaments of the candelabrum, with more ingenuity than clearness and plausibility]; the *incense* is the symbol of the name of God [for the incense represents prayer, and praying is equivalent to invoking the name of God! In the same manner, and with the same result, he applies this to the four different kinds of incense prescribed by Moses]; the *altar of incense* is a monument of blissful divine communication, and an exhortation for man to praise and to worship God, and to elevate himself to His perfection; it was square, because it was a place of revelation; the four horns denote the divine power, glory, and majesty; *the altar of burnt-offerings* was made of earth (אדמה), to remind of the sinfulness and frailty of man (אדם), for whose salvation the animal sacrifices were instituted; the frame-work was of acacia wood, because it was a place of light and life; it was covered with brass, which corresponds symbolically with the earth; its dimensions (five by

---

פ פ פ

כה 1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 2 דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
וְיִקְחוּ־לִי תְּרוּמָה מֵאֵת כָּל־אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִדְּבֶנּוּ לִבּוֹ תִּקְחוּ אֶת־
תְּרוּמָתִי׃ 3 וְזֹאת הַתְּרוּמָה אֲשֶׁר תִּקְחוּ מֵאִתָּם זָהָב וָכֶסֶף וּנְחֹשֶׁת׃
4 וּתְכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן וְתוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי וְשֵׁשׁ וְעִזִּים׃ 5 וְעֹרֹת אֵילִם

CHAPTER XXV.

SUMMARY.—God commands Moses to order the people of Israel to offer free-will gifts as the materials of a holy Tabernacle to be erected as a visible habitation of God, and for the garments of the priests who were to be consecrated. God describes the dimensions and construction of the ark, the mercy-seat, and the Cherubim; the shew-bread table and its utensils; the candlestick and its accessories.

1. The following commands (to xxxi. 17) were given to Moses during his forty days' stay on Mount Sinai (xxiv. 18); for in xxxi. 18 only it is related, that he received from God the two tables of the Law which were to be preserved in the holy ark (ver. 16: "which I shall give thee").

2. The whole people of Israel are invited to contribute their gifts for the erecting of the divine habitation, although certain individuals only were appointed to carry out the designs; and this is perhaps the reason of the transition of the third person ("that they take," ויקחו) into the second ("you shall take" תקחו).—תרומה, oblation, offering, originally, "that which is taken off" (from רום) or *separated* from the private property of the individual; and so translate the Targumim אפרשותא, and Rashi and Rashbam explain: "they shall lay aside from their wealth a separate gift as a free-will offering." So also Mendelssohn and others.—*For me* (לי), for my name, or, to my glorification.—נדב, as in Arabic, to urge, to impel; and therefore is נדבה the free-will and spontaneous impulse of a charitable heart without any consideration of personal interest. Onkelos, דיתרעי לביה, whose heart is willing or benevolent.

3. The abundance of precious metals and costly materials which the Israelites possessed in the desert, will be found explicable if we consider the following

three cubits) represent the preparatory degree of sanctity, perfection, and revelation; the washing of the hands and the feet in the *laver* signifies the sanctification of God and Israel; the mirrors [which Baehr believes were externally fastened on the laver] symbolize self-examination and self-knowledge, which must precede the purification, and were to remind the priests of their sinfulness.—The reader will, by this sketch of Baehr's system, be enabled to test the correctness of our opinion above pronounced on that author's views (p. 495), and we add, that in the details the relation between the Court and the tent, which he asserts to be that between earth and heaven, is almost entirely lost.—It will suffice merely to mention, without discussing, the opinion of the hypercritical school (*Bohlen*, *Vatke*, etc.), which sees in the Tabernacle a poor copy of the splendid Solomonic temple, after the model of which it was, in their opinion, fancifully conceived by a later writer, the author of the book of Exodus.

Numerous are the works written on the Tabernacle and its history, and besides the books occasionally mentioned in the preceding remarks, we refer to the lists collected by *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. ii. p. 529, and in *Kitto's* Cyclop. ii. p. 813.

CHAP. XXV. 1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying:
2. Speak to the children of Israel, that they bring me an offering; of every man whose heart impelleth him you shall take my offering. 3. And this is the offering which you shall take of them: gold, and silver, and brass,
4. And blue, and [1]red, and crimson, and fine linen, and goats' hair, 5. And rams' skins dyed red, and badgers'

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Purple, and scarlet.

points: 1st. they inherited from the patriarchs considerable wealth, of which we have no reason to suppose they were robbed in Egypt; there are, on the contrary, traces that they had no want of substance (compare xvi. 3; Numb. xi. 5). 2nd. They had received, at their departure from Egypt, very rich presents in gold and silver and raiment (see iii. 21, 22; xi. 2, 3; xii. 35, 36). 3rd. They enriched themselves by the spoil of the Egyptian army; and, 4th. of the defeated Amalekites. Besides, they had, no doubt, commercial intercourse with the mercantile caravans which traversed the desert, and which could supply them both with the necessaries and the luxuries which they desired (see note on xvi. 4). About the metals mentioned in our verse, see *supra*, p. 485.

4. About the *colours* (ארגמן , תכלת , and תולעת שני), see p. 486; those who translate blue, red, and crimson *wool* (Mendelssohn, and others), render the sense rather than the words. It appears from this verse, from xxvi. 1, and especially from xxxv. 25, that the *threads* were dyed before they were manufactured into cloth. That this was also the custom among the ancient Egyptians has been remarked in p. 489, and is testified by Minutoli (Tr. p. 402; *Pliny*, Hist. Nat. xxxv. 42, seems to allude to a later period). About linen (שש) and goat's-hair (עזים), see p. 487—489.

5. מְאָדָּמִים, Pual, with kametz-chatuph instead of kibbuz (מְאֻדָּמִים); compare שָׁדְּדָה, Nah. iii. 7; see Psa. xciv. 20.—ערת אילם מאדמים, *rams' skins dyed red;* (Germ., *Saffian;* French, *maroquin rouge*); the adjective (מאדמים), although properly belonging to ערת, conforms in gender with אילם, the nearer and, at the same time, more important part of the compound substantive; see note on xv. 4. So Rashi: "They were dyed red after

מְאָדָּמִים וְעֹרֹת תְּחָשִׁים וַעֲצֵי שִׁטִּים׃ 6 שֶׁמֶן לַמָּאֹר בְּשָׂמִים
לְשֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה וְלִקְטֹרֶת הַסַּמִּים׃ 7 אַבְנֵי־שֹׁהַם וְאַבְנֵי מִלֻּאִים
לָאֵפֹד וְלַחֹשֶׁן׃ 8 וְעָשׂוּ לִי מִקְדָּשׁ וְשָׁכַנְתִּי בְּתוֹכָם׃ 9 כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר
אֲנִי מַרְאֶה אוֹתְךָ אֵת תַּבְנִית הַמִּשְׁכָּן וְאֵת תַּבְנִית כָּל־כֵּלָיו וְכֵן
תַּעֲשׂוּ׃ ס 10 וְעָשׂוּ אֲרוֹן עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים אַמָּתַיִם
וָחֵצִי אָרְכּוֹ וְאַמָּה וָחֵצִי רָחְבּוֹ וְאַמָּה וָחֵצִי קֹמָתוֹ׃ 11 וְצִפִּיתָ אֹתוֹ
זָהָב טָהוֹר מִבַּיִת וּמִחוּץ תְּצַפֶּנּוּ וְעָשִׂיתָ עָלָיו זֵר זָהָב סָבִיב׃
12 וְיָצַקְתָּ לּוֹ אַרְבַּע טַבְּעֹת זָהָב וְנָתַתָּה עַל אַרְבַּע פַּעֲמֹתָיו וּשְׁתֵּי
טַבָּעֹת עַל־צַלְעוֹ הָאֶחָת וּשְׁתֵּי טַבָּעֹת עַל־צַלְעוֹ הַשֵּׁנִית׃ 13 וְעָשִׂיתָ

they were prepared"; Septuagint: δέρματα κριῶν ἠρυθροδανωμένα; Vulgate: pelles arietum rubricatas. — About the materials enumerated in this verse, see p. 489, 490. It is unnecessary to refute the Rabbinical opinion, that the Israelites brought the acacia wood with them from Egypt (see Ebn Ezra on our verse, whose hypothesis, however, is not much more plausible).

6. About the holy oil, see *supra*, p. 482. הסמים is the genitive, governed by קטרת, as Ebn Ezra and Nachmanides already observe, not, as Rashbam and others believe, accusative, depending from תקחו, in ver. 3: "and (take) the perfumes for the incense."

7. The objects here mentioned are described in the explanation of the priestly garments; see the notes on the twenty-eighth chapter.

8. The words, "that I may dwell among them," are usually considered as a parenthesis, the proper place of which would be at the end of the next verse. But, as the term *sanctuary* (מקדש) was mentioned, its end and purport is at once aptly described, with a few characteristic words (see *supra*, p. 493); and the following verse adds then another very essential feature and condition of the sacred structure (ככל .... וכן, according to all .... *even so*, with a strong emphasis).

9. God imparted to Moses the construction of the Tabernacle and its vessels, not merely by verbal description, but by showing him, in his vision on Mount Sinai (ver. 40), its model (תבנית; Septuagint, παράδειγμα) and prototype. It is undeniable, that the idea which our verse expresses (see also Num. viii. 4) is intended to enforce the conviction, that the Tabernacle has some higher purport and is designed after some more recondite plan; that it is to represent the internal spiritual connection between God and Israel, and that it implies a symbolical tendency which reaches far beyond its external construction; and it is a significant fact, that, indeed, both Jewish tradition and all the earlier commentators felt, almost without exception, the internal necessity of searching, beyond the immediate purpose of the edifice, after a deeper, more comprehensive, and more mysterious interpretation. But more than this we are not justified to infer from the obscure expression of our verse, and we cannot stop to examine speculations like those of several ancient commentators: that Moses really beheld the same Tabernacle in heaven, but on a more magnificent scale (see p. 496), or that God showed him all the mysteries of nature, which he then systematically embodied in the sacred edifice. It suffices that our text is important, as form-

skins, and acacia wood; 6. Oil for the light; spices for anointing-oil, and for incense of perfumes; 7. Onyx-stones, and stones for setting, for the ephod, and for the breast-plate. 8. And they shall make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them. 9. Quite so as I show thee the pattern of the Tabernacle and the pattern of all its instruments, just so shall you make it.—10. And they shall make an ark of acacia wood; two cubits and a half *shall be* its length, and a cubit and a half its breadth, and a cubit and a half its height. 11. And thou shalt overlay it with pure gold, within and without shalt thou overlay it, and thou shalt make upon it a crown of gold round about. 12. And thou shalt cast four rings of gold for it, and put *them* on its four [1]feet; and two rings *shall be* on the one side of it, and two rings on the other side of it. 13. And thou shalt make staves of acacia wood, and over-

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Corners.

ing a safe basis for the symbolical interpretation of the Tabernacle and its parts. That fundamental idea of the spiritual relation between God and Israel is at once plain and grand; and, whilst its simplicity stamps it with the character of primeval genuineness, its sublimity renders it worthy of forming the foundation of a religious system calculated to elevate and purify mankind to its remotest generations. But we must carefully abstain from working out this elementary idea into complicated and artificial details, foreign to the spirit of the nation and the time in which it originated. The sacred text is our only guide; and we must modestly resign every further progress when that only unfailing guide leaves us. —The Septuagint adds: *ἐν τῷ ὄρει* (בהר) after אותך, analogously to ver. 40.

10—15. *Description of the ark of the Covenant* (see p. 478). As the ark and the furniture immediately attached to it, the mercy-seat and the Cherubim, were the chief end of the whole structure of the Tabernacle (for the ark was to contain the "Tables of the testimony," the direct emanation of the Divine will; the mercy-seat was intended perpetually to maintain the purity of Israel and its harmony and connection with God by atonement and repeated communion, whilst the Cherubim represented the Divine presence and His watching Providence, see *supra*, p. 494): our text very appropriately begins with the description of these three utensils, which, in a higher sense, form an undivided unity, and symbolize the whole sum of revealed religion. From this reason they constitute the only contents of the Holy of Holies, and are not, like the vessels of the Holy, arranged as three separate articles; the mercy-seat and the Cherubim seem to have been worked from one solid mass of gold (vers. 18, 19), and to have formed one connected piece; and the ark was, by its own cover and the Capporeth doubly closed, to point at once to the paramount sacredness and the eternal perfection and unchangeableness of its contents, the Tables of the Law.—It will not be found surprising, but in exact accordance with the sanctity of the Holy of Holies, that later, when Moses orders, and Bezaleel enters upon, the actual execution of the

בַדֵּי עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים וְצִפִּיתָ אֹתָם זָהָב׃ 14 וְהֵבֵאתָ אֶת־הַבַּדִּים
בַּטַּבָּעֹת עַל צַלְעֹת הָאָרֹן לָשֵׂאת אֶת־הָאָרֹן בָּהֶם׃ 15 בְּטַבְּעֹת
הָאָרֹן יִהְיוּ הַבַּדִּים לֹא יָסֻרוּ מִמֶּנּוּ׃ 16 וְנָתַתָּ אֶל־הָאָרֹן אֵת הָעֵדֻת
אֲשֶׁר אֶתֵּן אֵלֶיךָ׃ שני 17 וְעָשִׂיתָ כַפֹּרֶת זָהָב טָהוֹר

different implements of the Tabernacle, those three articles are mentioned, not among the first, but among the later parts; for the framework of the structure was necessarily required for the reception of those most sacred utensils, before they could themselves, with propriety, be executed (see xxxv. 11—18; xxxvi. 8;—xxxvii. 9). From the same point of view, namely that of relative importance, the description of the altar of burnt-offerings precedes that of the Court itself, in which that altar was to be placed (compare xxvii. 1—8 and 9—19). In a less regular order is mentioned the altar of incense, which formed the third utensil of the Sanctuary. It is only introduced in xxx. 1, after the description of the Tabernacle itself, the vessels of the Court, and the garments of the priests. But in xxxi. 8; xxx. 15; and xxxviii. 1, it is mentioned in its due place.—In ver. 10 the *Israelites* are commanded to make the ark ("and they shall make," as in ver. 8, with regard to the whole Tabernacle), whilst in the 11th and the following verses, *Moses* alone is addressed, to intimate: 1. that the whole of Israel should manifest their zeal and interest in the construction of that sacred edifice, which was the symbol of unity with their God; and 2. that Moses was in this, as in many other respects, their representative, who served and acted in their stead. —The verb, "and thou shalt make," generally begins the command concerning a *new* article, but *not always;* as it is sometimes unavoidably used in the more minute description of a utensil already named. About the length of *a cubit* (אמה) see p. 490.—*Thou shalt overlay it* (וצפית) *with pure gold.* It is doubtful whether this expression signifies the modern art of gilding, or covering with thin plates of precious metal. The etymology of the Hebrew word offers no assistance, as it signifies merely *to make bright.* The same verb is, however, frequently used in the description of the temple of Solomon, in which, for instance, carved wooden-figures and flower-work were adorned in the same manner (1 Kings vi. 28, 35); and it is more than doubtful, whether the gold-leaf can be reduced to a degree of tenuity so as to be applicable for such purposes; but it might also be a matter of some difficulty to fasten plates to the round staves belonging to the Tabernacle. Although, therefore, overlaying might have been the usual, because more ancient process, gilding was applied in some cases, which must be inferred from probability. In Egypt the art of gilding was known and extensively used before the time of the exodus. The ruins and sepulchres of Thebes have, in this respect also, yielded us unexpected information. Numerous gilt bronze vases, trinkets, statues, toys, and many other objects in metal and wood have been discovered. If the faces of mummies, the painted cloth, the wooden coffin, and other objects were overlaid with thick gold-leaf, this was done intentionally, not from want of skill, which the Egyptians seem to have possessed in an extraordinary degree (see *Wilkinson,* Manners iii. 234—237; *Pettigrew,* Hist. of Egypt. Mummies, p. 63). The Talmud (Jomah, fol. 72) understands our verb, in all instances, as *plating,* and asserts even, but against our simple context, that Bezaleel made three chests, two of gold and one of acacia wood, all of them perfectly finished, but open; that he then put the wooden chest into the golden, and the other golden one into that of wood, and covered the uppermost; and thus the ark was overlaid with gold within and without.—The *crown of gold*

lay them with gold. 14. And thou shalt put the staves into the rings on the sides of the ark, to bear the ark with them. 15. The staves shall be in the rings of the ark; they shall not be taken from it. 16. And thou shalt put into the ark the testimony which I shall give thee.—17. And thou shalt make a mercy-seat of pure gold; two cubits and a half shall be its length, and a

on the ark was round its upper part, not round the middle, see p. 479.—Four golden rings were to be fastened to the *four feet* (פעמתיו), the construction of which, being quite subordinate and merely auxiliary parts of the ark, is not mentioned or described. This is the only probable meaning which can be attributed to the Hebrew word, which never signifies *corner*, although it is so interpreted by the Septuagint (*κλίτα*), Onkelos, Rashi, Kimchi, English Version, and many others. It is true it seems more plausible, that the rings, through which the staves were passed for the transportation of the ark, were rather in the middle, or more at the upper part of the ark, as thus it would have been easier to keep the equilibrium, especially as the Capporeth and the Cherubim increased the weight; and from this reason, no doubt, Ebn Ezra believes—but against the Hebrew text—that the four rings at the feet were merely for ornament, as is usual in chests. However, the smallness of the dimensions of the ark, renders its safe transportation, even with the rings at its feet, not impossible, especially as the greatest care was taken in carrying the sacred implements. Besides, as Nachmanides observes, "the respect due to the holy ark required that it was borne high and free above the shoulders of the priests." And the character and meaning of the ark demanded almost, that it should, in the journeys of Israel, be conspicuously visible to the whole people, like a divine standard, convincing them in their fatigues and tribulations of the protecting presence of the God, in whose name Moses had led them, in endless marches and circuits, from the fertile soil of Egypt to the barren and dreary tracts of the wilderness.

16. In the ark was to be deposited *the testimony* (העדות), that is, the two Tables of the Law, which were a witness of the divine covenant concluded with Israel, and through Israel with mankind, on condition of the moral laws engraved on them (see p. 493). But this testimony cannot be understood as a witness *against* Israel, "because it is not yet engraved on the hearts of Israel" (as Hengstenberg and others believe); it is, on the contrary, an eternal monument of Israel's faith and obedience (נעשה ונשמע), of its readiness not only to listen to His words (xix. 8; xxiv. 7), but to follow Him through "a pathless desert, in a land which is not sown" (Jer. ii. 2).—The two passages usually quoted in corroboration of that opinion (Deut. xxxi. 21, 26), uncertain in themselves, do not refer to the Tables placed in the ark, but to the whole Law and the parting song of Moses.—The circumstance, that our command concerning the Tables of the Law is repeated in ver. 21, has induced Rabbinical commentators to establish a distinction between these two passages (see *Nachmanides*, fol. 71 *a*.), whereas the 21st verse comprises, by way of recapitulation, the implements of the Holy of Holies, and their mutual position (for the Capporeth includes the Cherubim), and a mention of the ark occasions naturally an allusion to the Tables, which were the only end and contents of the ark.

17. About the *mercy-seat*, (כפרת) its sacredness and importance, see p. 479, and p. 494.

18—20. About the *Cherubim* and

אַמָּתַיִם וָחֵצִי אָרְכָּהּ וְאַמָּה וָחֵצִי רָחְבָּהּ׃ 18 וְעָשִׂיתָ שְׁנַיִם כְּרֻבִים
זָהָב מִקְשָׁה תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתָם מִשְּׁנֵי קְצוֹת הַכַּפֹּרֶת׃ 19 וַעֲשֵׂה כְּרוּב
אֶחָד מִקָּצָה מִזֶּה וּכְרוּב־אֶחָד מִקָּצָה מִזֶּה מִן־הַכַּפֹּרֶת תַּעֲשׂוּ אֶת־
הַכְּרֻבִים עַל־שְׁנֵי קְצוֹתָיו׃ 20 וְהָיוּ הַכְּרֻבִים פֹּרְשֵׂי כְנָפַיִם לְמַעְלָה
סֹכְכִים בְּכַנְפֵיהֶם עַל־הַכַּפֹּרֶת וּפְנֵיהֶם אִישׁ אֶל־אָחִיו אֶל־הַכַּפֹּרֶת
יִהְיוּ פְּנֵי הַכְּרֻבִים׃ 21 וְנָתַתָּ אֶת־הַכַּפֹּרֶת עַל־הָאָרֹן מִלְמָעְלָה
וְאֶל־הָאָרֹן תִּתֵּן אֶת־הָעֵדֻת אֲשֶׁר אֶתֵּן אֵלֶיךָ׃ 22 וְנוֹעַדְתִּי לְךָ
שָׁם וְדִבַּרְתִּי אִתְּךָ מֵעַל הַכַּפֹּרֶת מִבֵּין שְׁנֵי הַכְּרֻבִים אֲשֶׁר
עַל־אֲרוֹן הָעֵדֻת אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר אֲצַוֶּה אוֹתְךָ אֶל־בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ פ
23 וְעָשִׂיתָ שֻׁלְחָן עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים אַמָּתַיִם אָרְכּוֹ וְאַמָּה רָחְבּוֹ וְאַמָּה
וָחֵצִי קֹמָתוֹ׃ 24 וְצִפִּיתָ אֹתוֹ זָהָב טָהוֹר וְעָשִׂיתָ לּוֹ זֵר זָהָב
סָבִיב׃ 25 וְעָשִׂיתָ לּוֹ מִסְגֶּרֶת טֹפַח סָבִיב וְעָשִׂיתָ זֵר־זָהָב לְמִסְגַּרְתּוֹ
סָבִיב׃ 26 וְעָשִׂיתָ לּוֹ אַרְבַּע טַבְּעֹת זָהָב וְנָתַתָּ אֶת־הַטַּבָּעֹת עַל

their meaning, see p. 480, and p. 494.—They were to be made of *beaten work*, מקשה; Vulgate, opus ductile; not of *solid* gold, opposed to *hollow* work; nor *turned* work, as Gesenius, De Wette, Rosenmüller, and others, explain, from קשה, to turn or to make round (Arabic قشا). Compare 1 Kings, vi. 23, 28. Nor does it mean, as the ancient commentators usually explained, beaten with the hammer *out of one piece*, in opposition to a vessel joined together from different parts. However, the words "*from* the mercy-seat (מן־הכפרת) shall you make the Cherubim," justify us in supposing that they were not fastened to the former in any exterior manner, but that they were worked out of it, on both sides, as inseparably belonging to it; in the same manner as the horns projected from the altar (xxvii. 2: ממנו תהיין).—Philippson attributes to the Cherubim the meaning, "that they step between God and man (as angels), and without destroying the connection between both, they conceal from man the pure and divine spirituality which he is never permitted to attain." But such a complicated, and, in itself, contradictory notion of a separation in the unity, lies far from the true import of the ark and its accessories, which represent the full and unlimited connection between the purity of God and the soul of man; and if the latter does not reach the former, the obstacle lies in man, not in God, who emphatically and incessantly commands: "Thou shalt be perfect with the Lord thy God" (Deut. xviii. 13).—About the grammatical construction of מקשה תעשה אתם (the double accusative after עשה, one of which has almost an adverbial meaning) see *Ges.*, Gr. § 136, and *Ewald*, Gr. § 529; compare note on xii. 39.

21. The construction of the ark required that first the Tables of the Law were deposited in it, and that then only

cubit and a half its breadth.—18. And thou shalt make two Cherubim of gold, of beaten-work shalt thou make them, from the two ends of the mercy-seat. 19. And make one Cherub on the one end, and the other Cherub on the other end; [1]from the mercy-seat shall you make the Cherubim, on its two ends. 20. And the Cherubim shall stretch forth their wings over *it*, covering the mercy-seat with their wings; and their faces *shall look* one to another; towards the mercy-seat shall the faces of the Cherubim be. 21. And thou shalt put the mercy-seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony which I shall give thee. 22. And there I shall meet with thee, and commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two Cherubim, which *are* upon the ark of the testimony, of all *things* which I shall command thee *to say* to the children of Israel.—23. And thou shalt make a table of acacia wood; two cubits *shall be* its length, and a cubit its breadth, and a cubit and a half its height. 24. And thou shalt overlay it with pure gold, and make thereto a crown of gold round about. 25. And thou shalt make to it a border of a hand-breadth round about, and thou shalt make a golden crown to its border round about. 26. And thou shalt make for it four rings of gold, and put the rings in

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Even of.

the Capporeth was placed upon it: and thus it is, indeed, represented in the parallel passage, xl. 20.

22. *And there will I meet with thee.* God promises to reveal His will to Israel, through Moses, from the mercy-seat between the Cherubim; this is, therefore, the place of perpetual and direct revelation, or, of the "meeting of God and Israel," and hence the whole structure is called "the Tabernacle of meeting" (אהל מועד); see p. 493. Nearly all the ancient translations express this sense, except the Septuagint, which renders *καὶ γνωσθήσομαί σοι*, as if it had followed the reading ונודעתי instead of ונועדתי. As an interesting notice for the history of the Masorah, we observe, that both Rashi and Ebn Ezra seem to have read ואת כל־אשר and not את־כל, the easier reading, which our editions and the annotations of the Masorites offer; and Ebn Ezra strives even to explain the ו here very forcedly by *thus*, whilst Rashi considers it as superfluous.

23—29. *Description of the shew-bread table*, see p. 493. As the golden wreath round the ark has been believed to represent the "crown of the Law," so the wreath round the table has been asserted to signify "the crown of kingdom," which belongs to God, who, however, has not, since the creation, when He produced the world out of nothing, departed from the

אַרְבַּע הַפֵּאֹת אֲשֶׁר לְאַרְבַּע רַגְלָיו׃ 27 לְעֻמַּת הַמִּסְגֶּרֶת תִּהְיֶיןָ
הַטַּבָּעֹת לְבָתִּים לְבַדִּים לָשֵׂאת אֶת־הַשֻּׁלְחָן׃ 28 וְעָשִׂיתָ אֶת־
הַבַּדִּים עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים וְצִפִּיתָ אֹתָם זָהָב וְנִשָּׂא־בָם אֶת־הַשֻּׁלְחָן׃
29 וְעָשִׂיתָ קְּעָרֹתָיו וְכַפֹּתָיו וּקְשׂוֹתָיו וּמְנַקִּיֹּתָיו אֲשֶׁר יֻסַּךְ בָּהֵן
זָהָב טָהוֹר תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתָם׃ 30 וְנָתַתָּ עַל־הַשֻּׁלְחָן לֶחֶם פָּנִים
לְפָנַי תָּמִיד׃ פ
31 וְעָשִׂיתָ מְנֹרַת זָהָב טָהוֹר מִקְשָׁה תֵּיעָשֶׂה הַמְּנוֹרָה יְרֵכָהּ וְקָנָהּ
גְּבִיעֶיהָ כַּפְתֹּרֶיהָ וּפְרָחֶיהָ מִמֶּנָּה יִהְיוּ׃ 32 וְשִׁשָּׁה קָנִים יֹצְאִים
מִצִּדֶּיהָ שְׁלֹשָׁה ׀ קְנֵי מְנֹרָה מִצִּדָּהּ הָאֶחָד וּשְׁלֹשָׁה קְנֵי מְנֹרָה
מִצִּדָּהּ הַשֵּׁנִי׃ 33 שְׁלֹשָׁה גְבִעִים מְשֻׁקָּדִים בַּקָּנֶה הָאֶחָד כַּפְתֹּר

eternal and natural laws prescribed by Him to the universe, but who may make the simple shew-bread to yield the richest blessing. However judicious this application might be, it goes too far in symbolizing ornaments which were only intended to add to the dignity and splendour of the sacred utensils. The *border* was to be "of one hand-breadth" (טפח, palm). From 1 Kings vii. 26, compared with Jerem. lii. 21, it appears clearly that one hand-breadth is equal to the breadth of the *four fingers* of the hand, of course if closely pressed to each other; and hence the Vulgate translates here *four fingers* (quatuor digitis).—The rings for the staves were probably under the enclosure in the corners, where it joins the feet; therefore, "over against the border" (לעמת המסגרת). About the construction ונשא · · · את, see note on xxi. 28; the facilitating reading of the Samaritan codex: ונשאו בהם, is suspicious.—*With which the libations were made* ((אשר יסך בהן). The English version has followed the erroneous interpretation of ancient commentators, who derive יֻסַּךְ from סכך, to cover, the Hophal of which would, however, be יוּסַךְ, whereas that form is the Hophal of נסך, to pour out, to offer libations; whence the substantive נֶסֶךְ; and, as the shew-bread was a kind of peace-offering, its oblation was naturally, like all sacrifices of this class, attended with wine-libations, for which the vessels mentioned in our text were necessary. The confession of Maimonides (Moreh Neb. iii. 45) of his incapability of finding the signification of the shew-bread table proves the difficulty of the subject, which, however, disappears in a great measure, if this part of the Sanctuary is considered in connection with the general tendency of the holy structure. God creates every blessing, and bestows it upon man, from whom He requires nothing in return but a grateful acknowledgment of His gifts. And this is, in the simplest manner, done by the shew-bread, for which again the table was necessary, just as the ark for the Tables of the Law. Hence we cannot sympathise with the explanation of Philippson, who, however ably he develops it, takes the לחם הפנים as the "bread of Divine guidance, or as the prosperity produced by God's immediate providence." פנים, used with regard to God, means merely His nature or essence, and is frequently equivalent to the personal pronoun, like נפש and כבוד (see p. 454); and is, therefore, employed both in love and anger (for instance, Num. vi. 26: "The Lord lift up His countenance [פניו]

the four corners which *are* on its four feet. 27. Over against the border shall the rings be for places of the staves to bear the table. 28. And thou shalt make the staves of acacia wood, and overlay them with gold, that the table may be borne with them. 29. And thou shalt make its dishes, and [1]its bowls, and its cans, and its cups, with which the libations are made: *of* pure gold shalt thou make them. 30. And thou shalt put upon the table shew-bread before me always.—31. And thou shalt make a candlestick *of* pure gold; of beaten-work shall the candlestick be made; [2]its base, and its shaft, its calyxes, its apples, and its blossoms, shall be of the same. 32. And six branches shall come out of its sides; three branches of the candlestick out of the one side, and three branches of the candlestick out of the other side; 33. Three [3]calyxes of almond-flowers, *with* apple and blossom, on one branch;

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Spoons thereof, and covers thereof, and bowls thereof, to cover withal (or to pour out withal). [2] His shaft and his branches, his bowls, his knops, and his flowers. [3] Bowls made like unto almonds.

upon thee, and give thee peace"; and, Lev. xx. 3: "And I will set my face [פני] against that man, and cut him off from among his people"). Divine providence is, further, a notion so spiritual and ideal, that it can scarcely be represented by cakes or bread. The table, with its loaves, reminds of God as the supporter and preserver of the world, which He provides with sustenance; not of God as the mysterious dispenser of fate; they are a thank-offering, intended to keep alive practical piety and thankfulness, not a metaphysical emblem, which would have been superfluous after the promise of the pillar of cloud and the pillar of fire, which was to accompany Israel, as a symbol of Divine guidance, on all their journeys.

30. See p. 481. The shew-bread should be "before God always," that is, before the vail which separates the Sanctuary from the Holy of Holies, the proper residence of God. And from this reason they were unquestionably called in Hebrew, "the bread of the face," *viz.* of God; not because "their position was towards all sides of the Tabernacle," as several Rabbinical commentators believe. Rashbam understands: "fine bread, worthy to be placed before a king," after the questionable analogy of 1 Sam. i. 5.

31—40. *Description of the Candelabrum, its vessels and ornaments*, see p. 482. תֵּיעָשֶׂה (Future Niphal of עשה) stands merely instead of תֵּעָשֶׂה; the *scriptio plena*, with י, serving as a *mater lectionis*; as איתם = אתם, Psalm xix. 14; הֵימִיר = הֵמִיר, Jer. ii. 11; see *Gesenius*, Lehrg. pp. 52, 331. The Septuagint translates ποιήσεις, and seems, therefore, to have read, תַּעֲשֶׂה, whence it has too hastily been inferred, that the original reading was תעשה. Ebn Ezra saw manuscripts of the Pentateuch which had been carefully revised three times by scholars of Tiberias, and which had the reading תיעשה, although in French and Spanish copies he found this word without a י; and Kennicott quotes more than 150 manuscripts which have also the scriptio defectiva.—Michaelis believes, that גביע, calyx, is a general name, comprising the *perianthium* and the *corolla*,

וּפָרַח וּשְׁלֹשָׁה גְבִעִים מְשֻׁקָּדִים בַּקָּנֶה הָאֶחָד כַּפְתֹּר וָפָרַח כֵּן
לְשֵׁשֶׁת הַקָּנִים הַיֹּצְאִים מִן־הַמְּנֹרָה׃ 34 וּבַמְּנֹרָה אַרְבָּעָה גְבִעִים
מְשֻׁקָּדִים כַּפְתֹּרֶיהָ וּפְרָחֶיהָ׃ 35 וְכַפְתֹּר תַּחַת שְׁנֵי הַקָּנִים מִמֶּנָּה
וְכַפְתֹּר תַּחַת שְׁנֵי הַקָּנִים מִמֶּנָּה וְכַפְתֹּר תַּחַת־שְׁנֵי הַקָּנִים מִמֶּנָּה
לְשֵׁשֶׁת הַקָּנִים הַיֹּצְאִים מִן־הַמְּנֹרָה׃ 36 כַּפְתֹּרֵיהֶם וּקְנֹתָם מִמֶּנָּה
יִהְיוּ כֻּלָּהּ מִקְשָׁה אַחַת זָהָב טָהוֹר׃ 37 וְעָשִׂיתָ אֶת־נֵרֹתֶיהָ שִׁבְעָה
וְהֶעֱלָה אֶת־נֵרֹתֶיהָ וְהֵאִיר עַל־עֵבֶר פָּנֶיהָ׃ 38 וּמַלְקָחֶיהָ וּמַחְתֹּתֶיהָ
זָהָב טָהוֹר׃ 39 כִּכָּר זָהָב טָהוֹר יַעֲשֶׂה אֹתָהּ אֵת כָּל־הַכֵּלִים
הָאֵלֶּה׃ 40 וּרְאֵה וַעֲשֵׂה בְּתַבְנִיתָם אֲשֶׁר־אַתָּה מָרְאֶה
בָּהָר׃ שלישי ס

and that the former is כפתר, the latter פרח, so that he translates the phrase: גביעיה כפתריה ופרחיה: "blossoms, consisting of calyxes and corollae." But the tenor of ver. 33, appears to prove that these three terms express three different objects; and we take גביע as calyx, כפתר as apples or pomegranates, and פרח as blossom, with which the representation on the triumphal arch of Titus perfectly agrees.—ממנה, *of it* (ver. 31), namely, of the same pure gold, mentioned at the beginning of the verse. גביעים משקדים, are *calyxes of almond flowers*, for שקד is decidedly almond (Jer. i. 11, *et seq.*); Onkelos, Jonathan, Rashi, and others, translate, therefore, too indistinctly, *formed*, or, *shaped* (מציירין), or, with relievo work; and the Septuagint, not quite correctly, ἐκτετυπωμένοι καρυΐσκους, and so the Vulgate, "nucis in modum" (Aquila, aptly: ἐξημυγδαλωμένην). The Talmud (Men. 28) describes גביעים, as "goblets of Alexandria," כפתרים, as "apples of Crete," and פרחים, as "the flowers on columns."—As another illustration of the history of the Masorah, we remark, that the Talmud (Abod. Sar. 41) is doubtful whether משקדים belongs to the preceding or to the following part of the verse. The same uncertainty prevails in Gen. iv. 7, xlix. 7; Exod. xvii. 9; Deut. xxxi. 16.—Among the ancient nations the Egyptians especially possessed a peculiar predilection for flowers, both natural and artificial; the sacred lotus is almost invariably introduced as an ornament, and, according to Pliny (Hist. Nat. xxi. 22), they made fantastical flowers, which received the name *Egyptian flowers* (compare *Wilkinson*, Manners, ii. 183).—It is well known that the almond-tree is a Biblical type for rapid growth and vigilance; it is among the first trees to produce buds and fruits (compare Numb. xvii. 16—24; Jer. i. 11); and the almonds symbolize, therefore, on the candlestick, which is itself the emblem of enlightenment and knowledge, the quick diffusion and eternal efficacy of the latter through the word of God.—The words והאיר על־עבר פניה, in ver. 37, are obscure; they are usually translated: "that they (the lamps) may shine

and three calyxes of almond-flowers, *with* apple and blossom, on the other branch; so in the six branches which come out of the candlestick. 34. And on the candlestick *shall be* four calyxes of almond-flowers, *with* their apples and their blossoms. 35. And *there shall be* an apple under two branches of the same, and an apple under two branches of the same, according to the six branches which come out of the candlestick. 36. Their apples and their branches shall be of the same: all of it *shall be* one beaten-work *of* pure gold. 37. And thou shall make its lamps seven; and they shall [1]put on its lamps, and [2]light them to the side thereof. 38. And its [3]snuffers and its fire-shovels *shall be of* pure gold. 39. *Of* a talent of pure gold shall he make it, with all these vessels. 40. And see that thou make *them* after their pattern which was shown thee in the mount.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Light, or cause to ascend. [2] That they may give light over against it. [3] Tongs thereof and the snuff-dishes thereof.

forward" (*De Wette*), or "that they may give light over against it," (so *Rosenmüller*); or, "upon the table" (*Rashbam*). But, 1st. the singular והאיר cannot well be referred to the lamps; 2nd. the suffix in פניה, which points to נרתיה, is likewise anomalous, and פניהן would rather be required; 3rd. על־עבר, which means *to the side*, is scarcely regarded in those translations which, 4th, contain a rather superfluous injunction. We combine, therefore, our passage with Numb. viii. 3. (where על־עבר is apparently changed into אל־מול), the sense of which is clearly "he (Aaron) lighted the lamps thereof over against the candlestick, as the Lord commanded Moses." The shaft, as the principal part of the candelabrum, is used as identical with the candlestick itself (ver. 34); and our words mean: and he (the priest) shall light the lamps of the six branches so that their light falls to the side of the middle lamp, or that of the shaft; so that all the seven lamps seemed to have a connection and relation to each other; or that they might appear *one* (see xxv. 11. etc.).

39, 40. *Of a talent of pure gold shall he make it.* The second person, used in almost all preceding descriptions, changes here into the third person, according to a Hebrew idiom, implying an ellipsis: he to whom that duty devolves (here, the artist) shall make it; compare Gen. l. 26; Am. vi. 12; Isa. liii. 9; compare note on xiv. 6). The candelabrum, *together with* the snuffers and the fire-shovels, weighed one talent of gold, as the addition: "with all these vessels," clearly shows. About the weight and value of a *talent* (ככר) see note on xxi. 32.—אתה מָרְאֶה properly: "thou hast been made to see it," therefore: it has been shown to thee.

כו 1 וְאֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן תַּעֲשֶׂה עֶשֶׂר יְרִיעֹת שֵׁשׁ מָשְׁזָר וּתְכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן
וְתֹלַעַת שָׁנִי כְּרֻבִים מַעֲשֵׂה חֹשֵׁב תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתָם׃ 2 אֹרֶךְ ׀ הַיְרִיעָה
הָאַחַת שְׁמֹנֶה וְעֶשְׂרִים בָּאַמָּה וְרֹחַב אַרְבַּע בָּאַמָּה הַיְרִיעָה הָאֶחָת
מִדָּה אַחַת לְכָל־הַיְרִיעֹת׃ 3 חֲמֵשׁ הַיְרִיעֹת תִּהְיֶיןָ חֹבְרֹת אִשָּׁה
אֶל־אֲחֹתָהּ וְחָמֵשׁ יְרִיעֹת חֹבְרֹת אִשָּׁה אֶל־אֲחֹתָהּ׃ 4 וְעָשִׂיתָ
לֻלְאֹת תְּכֵלֶת עַל שְׂפַת הַיְרִיעָה הָאֶחָת מִקָּצָה בַּחֹבָרֶת וְכֵן
תַּעֲשֶׂה בִּשְׂפַת הַיְרִיעָה הַקִּיצוֹנָה בַּמַּחְבֶּרֶת הַשֵּׁנִית 5 חֲמִשִּׁים לֻלָאֹת
תַּעֲשֶׂה בַּיְרִיעָה הָאֶחָת וַחֲמִשִּׁים לֻלָאֹת תַּעֲשֶׂה בִּקְצֵה הַיְרִיעָה
אֲשֶׁר בַּמַּחְבֶּרֶת הַשֵּׁנִית מַקְבִּילֹת הַלֻּלָאֹת אִשָּׁה אֶל־אֲחֹתָהּ׃
6 וְעָשִׂיתָ חֲמִשִּׁים קַרְסֵי זָהָב וְחִבַּרְתָּ אֶת־הַיְרִיעֹת אִשָּׁה אֶל־

CHAPTER XXVI.

SUMMARY.—God further describes the structure of the Tabernacle itself: the boards, with their sockets and bars; the magnificent internal hangings; the threefold exterior coverings of goats'-hair, rams'-skins, and badgers'-skins; the vail between the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies, and the hanging before the eastern front of the Tabernacle.

1—6. *The ten internal curtains*, see pp. 477, 478. We must distinguish between the habitation (משכן) in our verse, and the tent (אהל) in ver. 7; the former expression describes, besides the frame-work, with the boards and columns, more the interior, the latter, more the external aspect of the holy structure; and the same difference exists, therefore, between the first and the three other coverings. The habitation was, by the mysterious forms of the Cherubim on its walls, manifested as the "habitation of God." The covering of goats'-hair gave it the appearance of a tent.—יריעה, curtain, hanging, from ירע, to tremble (Isa. xv. 4); it cannot be derived from ورع iv., "intercessit inter duos, eos disjungens," as in our verse, and in many other instances, it does not serve as a division to keep off the curiosity of intruders, but merely as a *hanging* or *covering*. In 2 Sam. vii. 2, the ark of God is called ישב בתוך היריעה, "dwelling between curtains."—The accusatives עשר יריעת וכו׳ designate the material of which the dwelling is to be made, or the manner of its construction; compare on xxv. 18. The *ten* curtains of the habitation denote its perfection and unity; they are, like the decalogue, divided into two halves; but they are again so combined, "that the habitation is *one*" (ver. 6).—About שש משזר, see p. 487, 488.—The English Version translates מעשה חשב, indistinctly, "of cunning work." That term is, indeed, not without difficulty, especially if compared with מעשה רקם, which seems regularly to be used in opposition to it. The internal curtains, the vail before the Holy of Holies, and the ephod and breast-plate of the High-priest, were of מעשה חשב; the two other vails, and the girdle of the common priests were מעשה רקם; whence it appears to result, that the former expression implies a more skilful or costly work than the latter (see vers. 31, 36; xxvii 16; xxviii. 6, 39). The opinions which have been advanced on this subject are: 1st. The מעשה חשב contains the figures of the Cherubim, the מעשה רקם does not.

CHAP. XXVI. 1. And thou shalt make the [1]habitation *with* ten curtains *of* fine twined linen, and blue, and red, and crimson: *with* Cherubim [2]of the work of the skilful weaver shalt thou make them. 2. The length of the one curtain *shall be* eight and twenty cubits, and the breadth of the one curtain four cubits: one measure *shall be* for all the curtains. 3. Five curtains shall be coupled together one to another; and five curtains *shall be* coupled one to another. 4. And thou shalt make loops of blue upon the border of the one curtain at the edge in the coupling; and the same shalt thou do [3]in the border of the uttermost curtain in the second coupling. 5. Fifty loops shalt thou make in the one curtain, and fifty loops shalt thou make in the edge of the curtain which *is* [4]in the second coupling; that the loops [5]may correspond one with another. 6. And thou shalt make fifty taches of gold, and couple the curtains together with the taches, that the habitation

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Tabernacle. [2] Of cunning work.
[3] In the uttermost edge of another curtain. [4] In the coupling of the second.
[5] May take hold one of another.

But the ephod of the High-priest, which was of the former description, was not adorned with the Cherubim. 2nd. The חושב is the artist who devises and invents the patterns; the רוקם is the weaver who executes them. But every article of similar manufacture requires both design and execution, and thus חושב and רוקם would, in fact, coincide, whilst they are clearly distinguished in the sacred text. 3rd. The מעשה חושב is a texture exhibiting the figures on both sides; the מעשה רוקם, needle-work or embroidery, with the figures on one side only. This is the ancient traditional and Talmudical explanation, which has, indeed, the greatest probability (compare *Talmud*, Jom. 9; *Maimonides*, Cl. Kod. viii.; Rashi, Ebn Ezra, on our verse; Septuagint, in xxvii. 16: ποικιλίᾳ τοῦ ῥαφιδευτοῦ for מעשה רוקם; in our passage: ἐργασίᾳ ὑφάντου for מעשה חושב; in xxxv. 35, τὰ ὑφαντὰ καὶ ποικιλτά; and in xxxviii. 23, more especially, τὰ ὑφαντὰ καὶ τὰ ῥαφιδευτὰ καὶ ποικιλτικά for חושב ורוקם; the poetical use of רקם, in Psa. cxxxix. 15, cannot be adduced against that signification; see *Braun*, Vest. Sac. Hebr. i. 297, *et seq.*; *Baehr*, Symb. i. p. 266—269, who compares the Spanish and Italian words *recamare* and *ricamare*, "to embroider"). The distinction between stuffs with interwoven and embroidered figures, was known in very early times; and Pliny (Hist. Nat. viii. 48) remarks: "Babylon was most celebrated for producing texturer with various colours, and they were therefore called *Babylonian*.... To make similar stuffs with the needle is an invention of the Phrygians, whence they are known under the name of *Phrygian* manufactures." (Compare *Herod.*, iii. 47). On the Egyptian monuments, both arts are represented; and it is known, that the sails of the pleasure-yachts of the Egyptian kings and grandees were embroidered with the figures of the phœnix, flowers, and other emblems, instances of which are found in the ruins of Thebes from so early a time as that of Rameses III. (see *Wilkinson*, Manners iii. 128, 210). There is, in Hebrew, a third expression,

אֶחָתָהּ בַּקְּרָסִים וְהָיָה הַמִּשְׁכָּן אֶחָד׃ 7 וְעָשִׂיתָ יְרִיעֹת עִזִּים
לְאֹהֶל עַל־הַמִּשְׁכָּן עַשְׁתֵּי־עֶשְׂרֵה יְרִיעֹת תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתָם׃ 8 אֹרֶךְ ׀
הַיְרִיעָה הָאַחַת שְׁלֹשִׁים בָּאַמָּה וְרֹחַב אַרְבַּע בָּאַמָּה הַיְרִיעָה
הָאֶחָת מִדָּה אַחַת לְעַשְׁתֵּי עֶשְׂרֵה יְרִיעֹת׃ 9 וְחִבַּרְתָּ אֶת־חֲמֵשׁ
הַיְרִיעֹת לְבָד וְאֶת־שֵׁשׁ הַיְרִיעֹת לְבָד וְכָפַלְתָּ אֶת־הַיְרִיעָה הַשִּׁשִּׁית
אֶל־מוּל פְּנֵי הָאֹהֶל׃ 10 וְעָשִׂיתָ חֲמִשִּׁים לֻלָאֹת עַל שְׂפַת הַיְרִיעָה
הָאֶחָת הַקִּיצֹנָה בַּחֹבָרֶת וַחֲמִשִּׁים לֻלָאֹת עַל שְׂפַת הַיְרִיעָה הַחֹבֶרֶת
הַשֵּׁנִית׃ 11 וְעָשִׂיתָ קַרְסֵי נְחֹשֶׁת חֲמִשִּׁים וְהֵבֵאתָ אֶת־הַקְּרָסִים
בַּלֻּלָאֹת וְחִבַּרְתָּ אֶת־הָאֹהֶל וְהָיָה אֶחָד׃ 12 וְסֶרַח הָעֹדֵף בִּירִיעֹת
הָאֹהֶל חֲצִי הַיְרִיעָה הָעֹדֶפֶת תִּסְרַח עַל אֲחֹרֵי הַמִּשְׁכָּן׃ 13 וְהָאַמָּה
מִזֶּה וְהָאַמָּה מִזֶּה בָּעֹדֵף בְּאֹרֶךְ יְרִיעֹת הָאֹהֶל יִהְיֶה סָרוּחַ עַל־צִדֵּי
הַמִּשְׁכָּן מִזֶּה וּמִזֶּה לְכַסֹּתוֹ׃ 14 וְעָשִׂיתָ מִכְסֶה לָאֹהֶל עֹרֹת אֵילִם
מְאָדָּמִים וּמִכְסֵה עֹרֹת תְּחָשִׁים מִלְמָעְלָה׃ פ רביעי
15 וְעָשִׂיתָ אֶת־הַקְּרָשִׁים לַמִּשְׁכָּן עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים עֹמְדִים׃ 16 עֶשֶׂר
אַמּוֹת אֹרֶךְ הַקָּרֶשׁ וְאַמָּה וַחֲצִי הָאַמָּה רֹחַב הַקֶּרֶשׁ הָאֶחָד׃
17 שְׁתֵּי יָדוֹת לַקֶּרֶשׁ הָאֶחָד מְשֻׁלָּבֹת אִשָּׁה אֶל־אֲחֹתָהּ כֵּן תַּעֲשֶׂה

מעשה ארג (xxviii. 32, etc), which signifies merely the tissue with the thread of one colour.—Both weaving and embroidering were, in Egypt, occupations of *men* (compare Herod. ii. 35, therefore the masculines חושב and רוקם); the weavers in Panopolis, Arsinoe, Pelusium, and Alexandria, were renowned in different periods (Strab. xvii. 813); on the monuments, weaving men are frequently met with; if women were engaged in the same pursuits, it was considered an exception (*Rosellini*, Monumenti II. ii. 30); their peculiar occupation seems to have been at the distaff (xxxv. 25); and, on the monuments, spinning men occur by far less frequently than spinning women (compare *Wilkinson*, Manners ii. 60; iii. 133).—The twenty-eight cubits of each curtain covered the ceiling and the north and south sides, only leaving one cubit open at the lower part of the sides (see p. 478).—לולאת, plural of לולי (from לול, to wind, to twist round; compare in Greek ἑλύειν, analogous to דוראים, from דודי, צבאים from צבי, כלאים from כילי, חלכאים from חלכי) *loops*; Septuagint, ἀγκύλαι; Vulgate, ansulæ; Chaldee, ענובין; compare 1 Kings vi. 8: לולים, winding stairs.—קֶרֶס (from קרס, to bend round, or to bow down, Isa. xlvi. 1, 2, kindred with כרע in meaning), *tache*, *hook*, into which the loops were put; Septuagint, κρίκοι; Vulg., circuli; Chaldee, פורפין; compare קרסל, joint, ancle (Psa. xviii. 57).

7—14. *The three coverings of the tent*, see p. 478. There is no probability for the conjecture, that the goats'-hair covering also was put at the inner side of the

may be one.—7. And thou shalt make curtains *of* goats' *hair*, to *be* [1]a tent over the habitation: eleven curtains shalt thou make. 8. The length of the one curtain *shall be* thirty cubits, and the breadth of the one curtain four cubits: one measure *shall be* to the eleven curtains. 9. And thou shalt couple five curtains by themselves, and six curtains by themselves, and shalt [2]roll up the sixth curtain in the forefront of the Tabernacle. 10. And thou shalt make fifty loops on the border of the one curtain *which is* the uttermost in the coupling, and fifty loops [3]on the border of the curtain in the second coupling. 11. And thou shalt make fifty taches of brass, and put the taches into the loops, and couple the tent together, that it may be one. 12. And the superfluity which remaineth of the curtains of the tent, the half-curtain which remaineth, shall hang over the backside of the Tabernacle. 13. And the cubit on the one side, and the cubit on the other side of that which remaineth in the length of the curtains of the tent, it shall hang over the sides of the Tabernacle, on this side and on that side, to cover it.—14. And thou shalt make a covering for the tent of rams'-skins dyed red, and a covering above *of* badgers'-skins.—15. And thou shalt make the boards for the Tabernacle *of* acacia wood, standing up. 16. Ten cubits *shall be* the length of the board, and a cubit and a half *shall be* the breadth of one board. 17. Two tenons *shall there be* to one board, arranged one against another: thus shalt thou make for

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Covering. [2] Double. [3] In the edge of the curtain which coupleth the second.

Tabernacle; it was not necessary that the one cubit which was, on the north- and south-side, left uncovered by the first and more precious curtains, should be overhung; that was, on the contrary, the only part which showed that the boards were over-laid with gold; if that was also covered, the costly metal would have been wasted for no purpose. Besides, if the goats'-hair covering were put *under* the first hangings, it would contradict the clear statement of the seventh verse; to hang it *above* them, and so to hide them entirely, is an absurdity.—סֶרַח (ver. 12, from סרח, to pour out, to stretch out), *superfluity*, that which extends or hangs over.

15—25. *The boards of the Tabernacle* (קרשים; Sept., *στύλοι*; Philo, *κίονες*; Onk., דפיא; Jon., לוחיא); see p. 476, 477. ידות is here translated by the Sept. with *ἀγκωνίσκοι*; the Vulg. with incastraturæ; the Chald., צירין; they are tenons fastened to the boards, one opposite the other or in symmetrical order (משלבות; Sept., *ἀντιπίπτοντας ἕτεροv*

לְכֹל קַרְשֵׁי הַמִּשְׁכָּן׃ 18 וְעָשִׂיתָ אֶת־הַקְּרָשִׁים לַמִּשְׁכָּן עֶשְׂרִים
קֶרֶשׁ לִפְאַת נֶגְבָּה תֵימָנָה׃ 19 וְאַרְבָּעִים אַדְנֵי־כֶסֶף תַּעֲשֶׂה
תַּחַת עֶשְׂרִים הַקָּרֶשׁ שְׁנֵי אֲדָנִים תַּחַת־הַקֶּרֶשׁ הָאֶחָד לִשְׁתֵּי
יְדֹתָיו וּשְׁנֵי אֲדָנִים תַּחַת־הַקֶּרֶשׁ הָאֶחָד לִשְׁתֵּי יְדֹתָיו׃ 20 וּלְצֶלַע
הַמִּשְׁכָּן הַשֵּׁנִית לִפְאַת צָפוֹן עֶשְׂרִים קָרֶשׁ׃ 21 וְאַרְבָּעִים
אַדְנֵיהֶם כָּסֶף שְׁנֵי אֲדָנִים תַּחַת הַקֶּרֶשׁ הָאֶחָד וּשְׁנֵי אֲדָנִים תַּחַת
הַקֶּרֶשׁ הָאֶחָד׃ 22 וּלְיַרְכְּתֵי הַמִּשְׁכָּן יָמָּה תַּעֲשֶׂה שִׁשָּׁה קְרָשִׁים׃
23 וּשְׁנֵי קְרָשִׁים תַּעֲשֶׂה לִמְקֻצְעֹת הַמִּשְׁכָּן בַּיַּרְכָתָיִם׃ 24 וְיִהְיוּ
תֹאֲמִם מִלְּמַטָּה וְיַחְדָּו יִהְיוּ תַמִּים עַל־רֹאשׁוֹ אֶל־הַטַּבַּעַת הָאֶחָת
כֵּן יִהְיֶה לִשְׁנֵיהֶם לִשְׁנֵי הַמִּקְצֹעֹת יִהְיוּ׃ 25 וְהָיוּ שְׁמֹנָה קְרָשִׁים
וְאַדְנֵיהֶם כֶּסֶף שִׁשָּׁה עָשָׂר אֲדָנִים שְׁנֵי אֲדָנִים תַּחַת הַקֶּרֶשׁ הָאֶחָד
וּשְׁנֵי אֲדָנִים תַּחַת הַקֶּרֶשׁ הָאֶחָד׃ 26 וְעָשִׂיתָ בְרִיחִם עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים
חֲמִשָּׁה לְקַרְשֵׁי צֶלַע־הַמִּשְׁכָּן הָאֶחָד׃ 27 וַחֲמִשָּׁה בְרִיחִם לְקַרְשֵׁי
צֶלַע־הַמִּשְׁכָּן הַשֵּׁנִית וַחֲמִשָּׁה בְרִיחִם לְקַרְשֵׁי צֶלַע הַמִּשְׁכָּן לַיַּרְכָתַיִם
יָמָּה׃ 28 וְהַבְּרִיחַ הַתִּיכֹן בְּתוֹךְ הַקְּרָשִׁים מַבְרִחַ מִן־הַקָּצֶה אֶל־הַקָּצֶה׃
29 וְאֶת־הַקְּרָשִׁים תְּצַפֶּה זָהָב וְאֶת־טַבְּעֹתֵיהֶם תַּעֲשֶׂה זָהָב בָּתִּים
לַבְּרִיחִם וְצִפִּיתָ אֶת־הַבְּרִיחִם זָהָב׃ 30 וַהֲקֵמֹתָ אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן כְּמִשְׁפָּטוֹ
אֲשֶׁר הָרְאֵיתָ בָּהָר׃ ס חמישי 31 וְעָשִׂיתָ פָרֹכֶת

τῷ ἑτέρῳ; for although the primitive meaning of שלב is, *to join*, we cannot understand ידות משלבות here as "tenons joined together by transverse pieces of wood under the sockets"). Now, the tenons were not fixed directly in the ground; for "the *habitation* of God should have no connection with earth"; but they were fitted into sockets (אדנים; Sept., βάσεις; Vulg., bases; Onk., סמכין); and these are inserted in the ground, so that one socket always corresponded with one tenon (see p. 477; compare *Joseph.*, Antiq. III. vi. 3). Tradition gives to the sockets a length of six, and a breadth of three palms, and maintains, with improbability, that they were placed *on* the ground, which would have raised the whole structure by about one cubit.—תמים (in ver. 24) must be taken as identical with תאמים; this reading is contained in the Samaritan codex, and expressed by Onkelos, Saadiah, and the Persian; Rashi, and others, explain the one by the other. The opinion, that the two boards at the corner did not form a right, but an obtuse angle, is to be rejected; for it would destroy the symmetry of the whole structure.

26—30. *The five bars* (בריחים), see p. 478. They were fitted into golden rings (ver. 29), except, perhaps, the mid-

all the boards of the Tabernacle. 18. And thou shalt make the boards for the Tabernacle, twenty boards on the south side, southward. 19. And thou shalt make forty sockets of silver under the twenty boards; two sockets under one board for its two tenons, and two sockets under another board for its two tenons. 20. And for the second side of the Tabernacle, on the north side, *there shall be* twenty boards: 21. And their forty sockets *of* silver; two sockets under one board, and two sockets under another board. 22. And for the [1]side of the Tabernacle westward thou shalt make six boards. 23. And two boards shalt thou make at the corners of the Tabernacle, in the two sides. 24. And they shall be [2]double beneath, and at the same time they shall be double above, at the one ring: thus shall it be for them both; they shall be for the two corners. 25. And they shall be eight boards, and their sockets *of* silver, sixteen sockets; two sockets under the one board, and two sockets under the other board.—26. And thou shalt make bars *of* acacia wood; five for the boards of the one side of the Tabernacle, 27. And five bars for the boards of the other side of the Tabernacle, for [3]the side westward. 28. And the middle bar in the midst of the boards shall reach from end to end.—29. And thou shalt overlay the boards with gold, and make their rings *of* gold *for* places for the bars: and thou shalt overlay the bars with gold. 30. And thou shalt rear up the Tabernacle according to its manner which was shown thee in the mount.—31. And thou shalt make a vail *of* blue, and

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Sides. [2] Coupled together beneath, and they shall be coupled together above the head of it unto one ring. [3] The two sides.

dle bar, which was, according to the traditional explanation, passed through the boards themselves, which were, for this purpose, bored through (see *Talm.*, Sabb. 98). בתוך, in ver. 28, cannot well be taken, "*at the middle* of the boards," as Baehr does, but must really be understood, "*through* the boards." Other commentators have proposed still less probable conjectures. It is, however, certain, that, as the middle-bar is expressly stated to have "reached from end to end," the others ran only along a part of the sides. The bars were especially necessary for giving the structure a greater compactness.

31—33. *The vail* (פרכת, perhaps, from פרך, to separate, to divide; see note on i. 13; Sept., καταπέτασμα) *between the Holy and the Holy of Holies*, (see

תְּכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן וְתוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי וְשֵׁשׁ מָשְׁזָר מַעֲשֵׂה חֹשֵׁב יַעֲשֶׂה
אֹתָהּ כְּרֻבִים׃ 32 וְנָתַתָּה אֹתָהּ עַל־אַרְבָּעָה עַמּוּדֵי שִׁטִּים מְצֻפִּים
זָהָב וָוֵיהֶם זָהָב עַל־אַרְבָּעָה אַדְנֵי־כָסֶף׃ 33 וְנָתַתָּה אֶת־הַפָּרֹכֶת
תַּחַת הַקְּרָסִים וְהֵבֵאתָ שָׁמָּה מִבֵּית לַפָּרֹכֶת אֵת אֲרוֹן הָעֵדוּת
וְהִבְדִּילָה הַפָּרֹכֶת לָכֶם בֵּין הַקֹּדֶשׁ וּבֵין קֹדֶשׁ הַקֳּדָשִׁים׃ 34 וְנָתַתָּ
אֶת־הַכַּפֹּרֶת עַל אֲרוֹן הָעֵדֻת בְּקֹדֶשׁ הַקֳּדָשִׁים׃ 35 וְשַׂמְתָּ אֶת־
הַשֻּׁלְחָן מִחוּץ לַפָּרֹכֶת וְאֶת־הַמְּנֹרָה נֹכַח הַשֻּׁלְחָן עַל צֶלַע הַמִּשְׁכָּן
תֵּימָנָה וְהַשֻּׁלְחָן תִּתֵּן עַל־צֶלַע צָפוֹן׃ 36 וְעָשִׂיתָ מָסָךְ לְפֶתַח הָאֹהֶל
תְּכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן וְתוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי וְשֵׁשׁ מָשְׁזָר מַעֲשֵׂה רֹקֵם׃ 37 וְעָשִׂיתָ

p. 478). It was hung up immediately beneath the golden taches of the inner covering, and thus formed, to the west, the Holy of Holies, ten cubits in length, and to the east, the Holy twenty cubits long. According to Jewish authorities, it was four fingers broad, to prevent any person penetrating with his eyes into the adytum. וָו is undoubtedly nail or hook; that root has, in most of the Oriental languages, the signification of connecting. Calmet, whom Clarke follows, believes that וו means the capital of a column, merely because he thinks that they are too necessary an ornament to be omitted. But they are certainly not indispensable; the *form* of the columns is, in other respects also, not described in detail; it was necessary to indicate the manner in which the vail was fastened to the columns; and the etymology of וו does not admit of the meaning "capital."

34. Into the Holy of Holies was placed the ark, with the mercy-seat; and, of course, the Cherubim on the latter, which are, however, not expressly mentioned, as they formed one whole with it.

35. According to ancient interpreters, the table stood two and a half cubits from the northern side, the candlestick as distant from the southern side, between both, the altar of incense, and all three vessels occupied the middle of the Holy, that is, they were ten cubits from each of the two inner vails. Certainly, the impression which this arrangement made on the entering priest must have been imposing enough to turn his mind at once to the holiest thoughts, and powerfully to remind him of his sublime duties, for which he was previously prepared by the sacred oil and the distinguishing garments. The Samaritan text inserts here the description of the altar of incense, from xxx. 1—10, and omits it in this latter place. But no ancient translation, nor any manuscript, offers a similar transposition; and, although we confess that that arrangement would be more regular, it is not the only one which the Biblical style admits; besides, xxx. 7—10 refer clearly to the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth chapters, and would be almost unintelligible in our place; the precepts concerning the altar of incense conclude the whole description of the holy vessels, because it implies the most sacred part of the daily functions of the priests.

36. The *vail at the eastern side*, which, according to Josephus, had, in inclement seasons, a linen cover, is not, like that between the two parts of the habitation,

red, and crimson, and fine twined linen; of the work of the skilful weaver shall it be made, *with* Cherubim. 32. And thou shalt hang it upon four pillars of acacia *wood* overlaid with gold: their hooks *shall be of* gold upon four sockets of silver. 33. And thou shalt hang up the vail under the taches, and shalt bring in thither, within the vail, the ark of the testimony: and the vail shall divide to you between the Holy and the Holy of Holies. 34. And thou shalt put the mercy-seat upon the ark of the testimony in the Holy of Holies. 35. And thou shalt set the table without the vail, and the candlestick over against the table on the side of the Tabernacle toward the south, and thou shalt put the table on the north-side. 36. And thou shalt make a hanging for the door of the tent, *of* blue, and red, and crimson, and fine twined linen, wrought with needlework. 37. And thou shalt make for the hanging five pillars of acacia *wood*, and overlay them with gold, *and* their nails *shall be of*

called פרכת, but simply מסך (from סכך, to cover or protect, instead of מסכך), and is, in several points, distinguished from it: it was not מעשה חשב, but מעשה רקם (see on vers. 1—6); no Cherubim were represented on it; it rested on five instead of four columns; and the sockets of the latter were not of silver, but of brass. Most of these circumstances prove, that the vail between the Tabernacle and the Court was not intended as equally costly and equally sacred as that between the Holy and the Holy of Holies. The absence of the Cherubim is especially characteristic; they symbolize the nearness of God; everywhere in the interior of the Tabernacle they were visible—on the mercy-seat, on the interior hangings, on the western vail; without the structure, they were nowhere represented. But we abstain here, also, from indulging in speculations about the typical meaning of the numbers, metals, colours, etc., and its application on the proportions of the holy tent; the end of the three parts of the structure: the Holy of Holies, the Sanctuary, and the Court, is self-evident; they represent the gradual approximation between God and Israel; in the Court, every individual approached God through the burnt-offerings; in the Sanctuary, the people came near God through its representatives, the priests; and, in the Holy of Holies, through the High-priest, the head of all the clerical functionaries: further, in the Court, merely by an external offering; in the Sanctuary, by the light of truth and by the ardour of faith; and, in the Holy of Holies, by revelation and atonement, those two highest means of connection between God and man. Recent commentators even have had the courage to follow the foot-steps of Baehr; they could not hope safely to gain the ports where this sagacious scholar wrecked, and their laborious efforts have only tended to encumber Biblical criticism with an additional burden of sophistical conjectures and mysterious combinations, convincing to none except their sanguine framers. The word of God is profound;

לַמָּסָךְ חֲמִשָּׁה עַמּוּדֵי שִׁטִּים וְצִפִּיתָ אֹתָם זָהָב וָוֵיהֶם זָהָב וְיָצַקְתָּ
לָהֶם חֲמִשָּׁה אַדְנֵי נְחֹשֶׁת׃ ששי ס

but it is vain to penetrate into subjects for which it gives itself no clue. The Law is written for man and for his use, to serve as an instrument of his salvation; the

כז 1 וְעָשִׂיתָ אֶת־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים חָמֵשׁ אַמּוֹת אֹרֶךְ וְחָמֵשׁ
אַמּוֹת רֹחַב רָבוּעַ יִהְיֶה הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְשָׁלֹשׁ אַמּוֹת קֹמָתוֹ׃ 2 וְעָשִׂיתָ
קַרְנֹתָיו עַל אַרְבַּע פִּנֹּתָיו מִמֶּנּוּ תִּהְיֶיןָ קַרְנֹתָיו וְצִפִּיתָ אֹתוֹ נְחֹשֶׁת׃
3 וְעָשִׂיתָ סִּירֹתָיו לְדַשְּׁנוֹ וְיָעָיו וּמִזְרְקֹתָיו וּמִזְלְגֹתָיו וּמַחְתֹּתָיו לְכָל־
כֵּלָיו תַּעֲשֶׂה נְחֹשֶׁת׃ 4 וְעָשִׂיתָ לּוֹ מִכְבָּר מַעֲשֵׂה רֶשֶׁת נְחֹשֶׁת
וְעָשִׂיתָ עַל־הָרֶשֶׁת אַרְבַּע טַבְּעֹת נְחֹשֶׁת עַל אַרְבַּע קְצוֹתָיו׃
5 וְנָתַתָּה אֹתָהּ תַּחַת כַּרְכֹּב הַמִּזְבֵּחַ מִלְּמָטָּה וְהָיְתָה הָרֶשֶׁת עַד

CHAPTER XXVII.

Summary.—The altar of burnt-offerings, with its utensils, and the Court which surrounds the Tabernacle are described. The use of pure olive-oil for the eternal light is commanded, and this service is for ever entrusted to Aaron and his descendants.

1—8. The altar of burnt-offerings, see p. 484. It is also called מזבח הנחשת "the brass altar," because it was overlaid with this metal, and מזבח החיצון, "the outer altar," because its place was without the habitation, in the Court.—The definite article in את המזבח does not refer back to the altar already mentioned in xx. 21; for the same form is used in xxvi. 15, with regard to the boards of the habitation (את הקרשים), although they are there mentioned for the first time; and in many other instances.—Its horns (קרנתיו) shall form one whole with the frame-work and the brass covering of the altar itself (ממנו תהיין), as was also commanded with regard to the mercy-seat and the Cherubim (xxv. 19). On these horns the blood of the sin-offerings was sprinkled (Lev. iv. 7, etc.); they were seized by the persecuted, who had sought refuge at the altar (1 Kings i. 50); perhaps also the sacrificial animals were fastened on them (Psalm cxviii. 27). Some commentators do not attribute to these projections the form of horns, but of cubes (which according to Hebrew tradition, were one cubit long, and as broad and high), or of little pyramids. But although קרן may sometimes signify an elevation generally (Isaiah v. 1), this is only a poetical figure derived from the similarity with a horn; the Sept. translates *κέρατα*; Josephus (Bell. Jud. V. v. 6), calls them *κερατοειδεῖς*; the altars of almost all ancient nations were frequently provided with horns ("cornibus ara frequens," *Martial*; compare the ara pacis among the Romans); they were not seldom, as trophies, entirely constructed of the horns of the sacrifices; and the representations of Egyptian and other Eastern altars show the same peculiarity. To understand, with Michaelis, קרנות merely as angles, synonymous with פנות, is precluded by the Hebrew text. The horns are a symbol of power, of protection, and help; and at the same time of glory and salvation; they represent,

gold: and thou shalt cast five sockets of brass for them.

leading ideas can, therefore, not be so hidden or obscure that they permit opposite interpretations; what is not clearly alluded to is forced and spurious.

CHAP. XXVII. 1. And thou shalt make the altar of acacia wood, five cubits the length, and five cubits the breadth; the altar shall be square; and its height *shall be* three cubits. 2. And thou shalt make its horns upon its four corners; its horns shall be of the same: and thou shalt overlay it with brass. 3. And thou shalt make [1]its pots to remove its ashes, and its shovels, and its basins, and its flesh-hooks, and its fire-shovels; all the vessels thereof thou shalt make *of* brass. 4. And thou shalt make for it a grate of net-work *of* brass; and upon the net thou shalt make four brazen rings in its four corners. 5. And thou shalt put it under the border beneath, that the net may reach to the midst of the altar.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Its pans to receive.

therefore, significantly the whole meaning and end of the sacrifices; and they manifest that that salvation is effected through animals. And hence all the members of the house of Israel were permitted access not only to the Court, which stood uncovered, free in the air, but to this altar; this was the first step towards a unity between God and man; and here the individual might sufficiently purify himself from guilt and sin, to participate in the national unity between God and Israel, represented through the priests in the interior of the holy habitation.—דשן in Piel signifies, "to remove the ashes"; for the Piel has not unfrequently such negative meaning, as, for instance, שרש "to remove the roots," that is, to eradicate, etc.; and so Ebn Ezra, in our passage, להסיר הדשן.—The ל in לכל כליו (ver. 3), sums up the individual objects previously enumerated; so in Gen. ix. 10, לכל חית הארץ; or it means "together with." It is, therefore, not the dative instead of the accusative, as Rosenmüller and others believe; nor is it quite unforced to explain with Maurer: "quod attinet ad omnia vasa ejus, facias ea ex aere" (compare ver. 19, where the Samaritan text offers the easier, and therefore suspicious reading, ועשית את כל וכ').—The Septuagint translates מכבר וכ' by *ἐσχάραν ἔργῳ δικτυωτῷ χαλκῆν*, and Vulgate by "craticulam in modum retis aeneam," by which renderings it is confirmed that the translation of מכבר by grate is essentially correct; compare also Onkelos סרדא, and Am. ix. 9.—כרכב is rendered by Onkelos with סובבא, which is anything which goes round or encircles, that is, a border; and by the Syrian with שבולותי, which has the same meaning; Rosenmüller calls it strangely, "deambulacrum," and explains it as a kind of balustrade round the altar, on which the priests could more conveniently perform their functions (compare *Talm.*, Seb. 52. *b*). But that the height of the altar did not require such arrangement, has been shown

חֲצִי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ׃ 6 וְעָשִׂיתָ בַדִּים לַמִּזְבֵּחַ בַּדֵּי עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים וְצִפִּיתָ
אֹתָם נְחֹשֶׁת׃ 7 וְהוּבָא אֶת־בַּדָּיו בַּטַּבָּעֹת וְהָיוּ הַבַּדִּים עַל־שְׁתֵּי
צַלְעֹת הַמִּזְבֵּחַ בִּשְׂאֵת אֹתוֹ׃ 8 נְבוּב לֻחֹת תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתוֹ כַּאֲשֶׁר
הֶרְאָה אֹתְךָ בָּהָר כֵּן יַעֲשׂוּ׃ ס שביעי 9 וְעָשִׂיתָ אֵת
חֲצַר הַמִּשְׁכָּן לִפְאַת נֶגֶב־תֵּימָנָה קְלָעִים לֶחָצֵר שֵׁשׁ מָשְׁזָר מֵאָה
בָאַמָּה אֹרֶךְ לַפֵּאָה הָאֶחָת׃ 10 וְעַמֻּדָיו עֶשְׂרִים וְאַדְנֵיהֶם עֶשְׂרִים
נְחֹשֶׁת וָוֵי הָעַמֻּדִים וַחֲשֻׁקֵיהֶם כָּסֶף׃ 11 וְכֵן לִפְאַת צָפוֹן בָּאֹרֶךְ
קְלָעִים מֵאָה אֹרֶךְ וְעַמֻּדָו עֶשְׂרִים וְאַדְנֵיהֶם עֶשְׂרִים נְחֹשֶׁת וָוֵי
הָעַמֻּדִים וַחֲשֻׁקֵיהֶם כָּסֶף׃ 12 וְרֹחַב הֶחָצֵר לִפְאַת־יָם קְלָעִים
חֲמִשִּׁים אַמָּה עַמֻּדֵיהֶם עֲשָׂרָה וְאַדְנֵיהֶם עֲשָׂרָה׃ 13 וְרֹחַב הֶחָצֵר
לִפְאַת קֵדְמָה מִזְרָחָה חֲמִשִּׁים אַמָּה׃ 14 וַחֲמֵשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה אַמָּה
קְלָעִים לַכָּתֵף עַמֻּדֵיהֶם שְׁלֹשָׁה וְאַדְנֵיהֶם שְׁלֹשָׁה׃ 15 וְלַכָּתֵף
הַשֵּׁנִית חֲמֵשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה קְלָעִים עַמֻּדֵיהֶם שְׁלֹשָׁה וְאַדְנֵיהֶם שְׁלֹשָׁה׃
16 וּלְשַׁעַר הֶחָצֵר מָסָךְ ׀ עֶשְׂרִים אַמָּה תְּכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן וְתוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי
וְשֵׁשׁ מָשְׁזָר מַעֲשֵׂה רֹקֵם עַמֻּדֵיהֶם אַרְבָּעָה וְאַדְנֵיהֶם אַרְבָּעָה׃
מפטיר 17 כָּל־עַמּוּדֵי הֶחָצֵר סָבִיב מְחֻשָּׁקִים כֶּסֶף וָוֵיהֶם

ס ועמדיו ק׳

in the note on xx. 23.—The altar was to be "hollow with boards" (נבוב לחת; Sept. κοῖλον σανιδωτόν), but was, in accordance with xx. 21, naturally filled with earth (wherefore Jonathan adds: מלי עפרא), not only the upper part, whilst the lower one was hollow, as Michaelis believes, but entirely. The wooden frame-work was carried by the Israelites on their journeys, whilst the earth remained perhaps, as a mark of their stations, just as the frame-work was during the journeys the emblem of the altar rather than this implement itself; for the earth constituted the altar. It is, therefore, erroneous, if Clarke writes: "The altar seems to have been a kind of frame-work, and to have had nothing solid in the inside, and only covered with the grating of the top." Just the top, on which the sacrifices were burnt, consisted of earth; and the grating was not on the top, but round the sides, beneath the border. The wooden frame was protected against the injurious influence of the fire, within by the earth, and without by the metal with which it was covered, and which was, perhaps, at the top a little thicker, and bent round the wood. On the altar fire was always entertained (Lev. vi. 6). Whether it had a bottom of the same materials as the sides is uncertain. The ashes were placed on the eastern side of the altar; to the west stood the brazen laver, and to the south, according to tradition, the sloping dam

6. And thou shalt make staves for the altar, staves of
acacia wood, and overlay them with brass. 7. And the
staves shall be put into the rings, and the staves shall be
upon the two sides of the altar[1] in carrying it. 8. Hollow
with boards shalt thou make it; as it was shown thee in
the mount, so shall they make *it*.—9. And thou shalt
make the Court of the Tabernacle: for the south-side
southward *there shall be* hangings for the Court *of* fine
twined linen of one hundred cubits long for one side:
10. [2]And its pillars *shall be* twenty, and their sockets,
twenty, *of* brass; the hooks of the pillars, and their rods,
of silver. 11. And likewise for the north-side in length
there shall be hangings of one hundred *cubits* long, and its
pillars twenty, and their sockets twenty of brass; the
hooks of the pillars and their rods, of silver. 12. And
for the breadth of the Court on the west-side *shall be*
hangings of fifty cubits: their pillars ten, and their
sockets ten. 13. And the breadth of the Court on
the east-side eastward *shall be* fifty cubits. 14. The
hangings on one side *of the gate shall be* fifteen cubits;
their pillars three, and their sockets three; 15. And on
the other side *shall be* hangings fifteen *cubits;* their pillars
three, and their sockets three. 16. And for the gate of
the Court *shall be* a hanging of twenty cubits, *of* blue, and
red, and crimson, and fine twined linen, the work of the
embroiderer; *and* their pillars *shall be* four, and their
sockets four. 17. All the pillars round about the Court
shall be united with rods of silver; their hooks *shall be of*

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—To bear it. [2] And the twenty pillars thereof and their twenty sockets *shall be* of brass.

which led up to the upper surface. As several parts of the altar of burnt-offerings are indeed obscure, the text refers to the prototype which Moses had seen on the mountain, and which he is commanded to imitate.

9—19. The Court, see p. 483. קלעים hangings, Sept. *ἱστία*; Rashi explains likewise, "made like the sails of a ship, meshy, not woven"; and Onkelos translates קלעים with the same word סרדה with which he renders מכבר in ver. 4. But although these hangings were only five cubits high (ver. 18) and covered only half the height of the Tabernacle; and although it might thus not appear inappropriate to suppose, that the other half was likewise partly visible by the meshes of the net-work: the statement, that those hangings were of שש משזר precludes that conception (see p. 489). חשוקים (Sept. *ψαλίδες*, Onkelos כיבושין)

כֶּסֶף וְאַדְנֵיהֶם נְחֹשֶׁת׃ 18 אֹרֶךְ הֶחָצֵר מֵאָה בָאַמָּה וְרֹחַב ׀
חֲמִשִּׁים בַּחֲמִשִּׁים וְקֹמָה חָמֵשׁ אַמּוֹת שֵׁשׁ מָשְׁזָר וְאַדְנֵיהֶם נְחֹשֶׁת׃
19 לְכֹל כְּלֵי הַמִּשְׁכָּן בְּכֹל עֲבֹדָתוֹ וְכָל־יְתֵדֹתָיו וְכָל־יִתְדֹת הֶחָצֵר
נְחֹשֶׁת׃ ס

are *rods*, after the analogy of חִשֻּׁקִים in 1 Kings vii. 33, which means the spokes of a wheel, which join the nave and the rim; not rings, as some expositors believe, who think that the 1775 shekels of silver applied for the hooks and capitals (xxxviii, 28), would not have sufficed for those rods besides. The breadth of the Court shall be חמשים בחמשים (ver. 18), that is, probably, fifty cubits on every part; or, as Targum Jonathan expresses it, fifty cubits to the west, and fifty to the east; Septuagint, πεντήκοντα ἐπὶ πεντήκοντα; it can

ס ס ס

20 וְאַתָּה תְּצַוֶּה ׀ אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִקְחוּ אֵלֶיךָ שֶׁמֶן זַיִת זָךְ
כָּתִית לַמָּאוֹר לְהַעֲלֹת נֵר תָּמִיד׃ 21 בְּאֹהֶל מוֹעֵד מִחוּץ לַפָּרֹכֶת
אֲשֶׁר־עַל הָעֵדֻת יַעֲרֹךְ אֹתוֹ אַהֲרֹן וּבָנָיו מֵעֶרֶב עַד־בֹּקֶר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה
חֻקַּת עוֹלָם לְדֹרֹתָם מֵאֵת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ ס

20, 21. About the "pure beaten olive-oil," to be used for the candelabrum, see p. 482. זך belongs to שמן, not to זית, as Ebn Ezra believes, so that שמן זית זך would mean "oil of pure olives." שמן זית is one notion, to which the adjective זך refers. The light was to burn from evening to morning (xxx. 8), and a quantity of oil sufficient for this purpose (according to tradition, half a log) was, in the evening, to be put into the lamps. But, in order to make it literally "a perpetual light" (נר תמיד), and because no sky-light fell into the structure, surrounded as it was with a fourfold covering, it seems to have been customary in the service of the temple, that one light at least was always burning (see ibid.; compare, however, 1 Sam. iii. 3); although the word תמיד, if added to sacrifices or other sacred functions, means merely such as recur regularly and at appointed times (Num. iv. 16, etc.); and Ebn Ezra explains למאור by לצורך האור בלילה; and תמיד by כל לילה ולילה.—להעלות is rendered by Onkelos

כח 1 וְאַתָּה הַקְרֵב אֵלֶיךָ אֶת־אַהֲרֹן אָחִיךָ וְאֶת־בָּנָיו אִתּוֹ מִתּוֹךְ

CHAPTER XXVIII.

SUMMARY.—Aaron and his sons are appointed priests, and their official garments described; namely, for the common priests: 1. the tesselated tunic (כתנת תשבץ); 2. the drawers (מכנסים); 3. the girdle (אבנט); 4. the turban (מגבעה); to which were added, for the High-priest: 5. the robe (מעיל); 6. the ephod (אפוד); 7. the breast-plate (חשן), with the Urim and Thummim (אורים ותמים); and, 8. the mitre (מצנפת), with the golden plate (ציץ). The priests are commanded never to perform the service without any of these prescribed garments; and punishment of death is threatened to him who trespasses this command.

1. The Israelites had been selected by God among all the nations of the earth to be His peculiar people (xix. 5; compare Hos. iv. 6); God has brought them to

silver, and their sockets *of* brass. 18. The length of the Court *shall be* one hundred cubits, and the breadth fifty everywhere, and the height five cubits *of* fine twined linen, and their sockets *of* brass. 19. All the vessels of the Tabernacle in all its service, and all its pins, and all the pins of the Court, *shall be of* brass.

scarcely imply, that the Court was, on the eastern side, fifty cubits long and fifty cubits broad (*Talm.*, Erub. 23); although, as we have shown, this seems really to have been the case, and the eastern part, where the two vessels stood, the altar and the laver, and where the sacrifices were performed, might be called the Court in a stricter sense. The Samaritan codex has באמה instead of בחמשים; and adds further, after ver. 19: ועשית בגדי תכלת ותולעת שני לשרת בהם בקדש.

20. And thou shalt command the children of Israel, that they bring thee pure beaten olive-oil for the light, to put on the lamps for ever. 21. In the [1]Tent of Meeting without the vail, which *is* before the testimony, Aaron and his sons shall arrange it from evening to morning before the Lord: *it shall be* a statute for ever to your generations, on the part of the children of Israel.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Tabernacle of the Congregation.

with לאדלקא, and interpreted by Rashi, Ebn Ezra, and others, with להדליק; compare, however, xxv. 37, where the same verb signifies merely, to put on, to arrange, the lamps.—אהל מועד is the "tent of meeting," or the "tent of appointment," not the "tabernacle of the congregation" (Engl. Vers.), or משכן זימנא (Onkelos and Jonathan); for God promises to meet there Moses and Aaron, through His revelations; it was not directly a place of assembly for the people (see p. 493; compare xxv. 22; xxix. 42). And because the temple is also the place appointed for the Divine abode, it is likewise called מועד (Psa. lxxiv. 8).—על העדות is identical with לפני ארון העדות, "before the ark of the testimony" (see xxvi. 33).—The Samaritan codex reads לדרתיכם; and so renders the Septuagint: εἰς τὰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν.

CHAP. XXVIII. 1. And bring [1]thou near to thee Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him from among the

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Take thou.

Himself (ver. 4), whereas before they were as distant from Him as all the idol-worshippers; He destined them to be a holy people, a kingdom of priests (ver. 6); all the laws and institutions which He ordained tended only to prepare them for this vocation, to realize this promise. What the Israelites were among the nations, were the Levites among the tribes of the Hebrews. God calls Israel His first-born son; and the Levites represent, in Israel, the first-born sons (note on xiii. 2). Israel is the host, the army, the champion of God; and in Israel again, the Levites are His troops, who fight His battles (xxxii. 28; Deut.

בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְכַהֲנוֹ־לִי אַהֲרֹן נָדָב וַאֲבִיהוּא אֶלְעָזָר וְאִיתָמָר בְּנֵי
אַהֲרֹן׃ 2 וְעָשִׂיתָ בִגְדֵי־קֹדֶשׁ לְאַהֲרֹן אָחִיךָ לְכָבוֹד וּלְתִפְאָרֶת׃
3 וְאַתָּה תְּדַבֵּר אֶל־כָּל־חַכְמֵי־לֵב אֲשֶׁר מִלֵּאתִיו רוּחַ חָכְמָה וְעָשׂוּ
אֶת־בִּגְדֵי אַהֲרֹן לְקַדְּשׁוֹ לְכַהֲנוֹ־לִי׃ 4 וְאֵלֶּה הַבְּגָדִים אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשׂוּ

xxxiii. 8—11, etc.). But, among the Levites, the family of Aaron is singled out for the immediate servants of God; the other branches of this tribe are only the ministers, the menials of the Aaronites; the latter alone represent Israel as a kingdom of priests; they are more properly the connecting link between God and Israel; and, therefore, our verse uses, with regard to Aaron and his sons, the same significant idea of *bringing near* (הקרב), with which the election of Israel as the peculiar people was designated (chap. xix.; compare Lev. vii. 35; x. 3); and as there the separation took place "from all the nations" (מכל העמים, ver. 5), so here, "from the midst of Israel" (מתוך בני ישראל), which, though consecrated in its totality, requires mediators exclusively and entirely devoted to sanctification and religious service. And in order to give to this idea of priestly sanctity the most concrete shape of which it is capable, God distinguished and separated among the Aaronites again one individual, the High-priest, who united in his person, and represented in a striking manner, the whole sum of the theocratical truths; he was the head of the state, its spiritual king; his mere appearance recalled forcibly the centre and kernel of the Mosaic doctrines; his office symbolized the internal relation between God and Israel, the duties of the individual, and the great historical mission of the nation. Hence the minuteness is explicable with which the official robes of the priests are ordered and described; they were intended to represent sublime and important ideas; they were auxiliary means for impressing upon the people the vocation of Israel; they can, therefore, not be insignificant, accidental, or arbitrary; we are not only entitled, but compelled, to search after the ideas embodied in the garments; and we reject at once and entirely the views of those who see, in the complicated priestly dress, nothing but an aggregate of unconnected pieces, without meaning or ulterior aim, only calculated to enhance the pomp of the priests, and thus to awe by external splendour the impressible senses of the multitude.—The suffix in לכהנו applies to Aaron, as the most important individual among those mentioned before, and as the designated High-priest; and he is, in fact, alone named in the following verse. Moreover, it is known, that the Hebrew suffixes do not always correspond quite exactly with the nouns to which they belong; and the singular is not unfrequently used instead of the plural. The ו cannot be taken, with Ebn Ezra, whom several modern commentators have followed, as a *Vav paragogicum*; for this is only added to substantives, generally to indicate the *status constructus* (for instance, חיתו שדי, Psa. cii. 11; בנו בעור, Num. xxiv. 3, 15, etc.), not to verbs. The renderings of Onkelos and Jonathan by לשמשא קדמי, or of the Septuagint by *ἱερατεύειν μοι*, are no proof for that opinion. Although כהן in Piel is frequently intransitive: "to serve as priest" (ver. 41; xxix. 1, etc.; comp. ver. 20; כון=כהן); it is by no means impossible that it is sometimes also transitive, which is the usual meaning of Piel; לכהנו is, therefore, parallel with הקרב, and is synonymous with לקדשו (ver. 3; xxix. 1, etc.); Mendelssohn: "Ihn zu meinem Dienst einzuweihen."—About the sons of Aaron, see vi. 23, where they are enumerated in the same order as in our verse.

2. The garments of Aaron are called holy, because they were necessarily worn during the performance of his official

children of Israel, [1] to initiate him to my service, *namely*, Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, Elazar and Ithamar, Aaron's sons. 2. And thou shalt make holy garments for Aaron thy brother, for glory and [2] distinction. 3. And thou shalt speak to [3] all *who have* a wise heart, which I have filled with the spirit of wisdom, that they make Aaron's garments to consecrate him, and to initiate him to my service. 4. And these *are* the garments which they shall

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—That he may minister unto me in the priest's office. [2] Beauty.
[3] All that are wise-hearted, which I have filled.

functions; they were as indispensable for the priests as the priests were indispensable for the Tabernacle; and everything is holy which stands in connection with the sacred habitation of God. If, therefore, the Tabernacle has any meaning beyond a mere tent of boards and curtains, the priestly robes must be drawn into the same circle of ideas. But these robes are further intended to be "for glory and for beauty;" they are the external marks of distinction; they manifest him who wears them as conspicuous in dignity and holiness; they represent his elevation and his important spiritual privileges.

3. Every faculty, every knowledge which man possesses, is a gift of God; without His assistance man is unable to attain either at moral perfection or intellectual clearness; even the ability of the workman is a gracious present of the Lord, who "fills the heart with the spirit of wisdom." In Biblical phraseology the *heart* (לב) is considered as the seat of the *mental* powers, as well as of feeling; חכם לב is a man of intelligence, opposed to חסר לב (compare כח לב, Job xxxvi. 5; אנשי לבב, Job xxxiv. 10; 1 Kings iii. 9—12; Prov. xvii. 16; and in Greek φρήν). Now, the artists and workmen are not filled with that divine spirit for the special purpose of preparing the priestly robes, but Moses is ordered to invite all those who feel in themselves the ability, to assist in this holy work.

4. In the summary of this chapter we have enumerated the eight parts of the priestly dress. Now, it is at least remarkable, that the robes of the common priest consisted of four parts, but those of the High-priest of twice four, and that the latter, on the Day of Atonement, when he performed the most important acts of his office, changed four pieces for four others. It is a matter of course, that the different commentators apply to the garments of the priests the same principles of symbolical explanation which they endeavoured to demonstrate in the Holy Tabernacle, and we meet here, indeed, with the same variety of opinions, the same sagacity and learning, and the same artificiality and futility. We find the cosmical, rabbinical, typical and modern negative conception; and Baehr has continued his eloquent argumentations, although, on the whole, his results are here by far happier than in his theory on the Tabernacle (see, however, *infra*). But the number four typifies to him divine revelation, and their garments show, therefore, that they are "the living instruments of revelation," because "their service is entirely bound to the Tabernacle, which is the place of testimony and revelation." But it is impossible to sympathize with this exposition; the priests are the representatives of the people rather than of God; they bring the sentiments of Israel before God, not the will of God before Israel; not to reveal, but to obey, is their office. If we are to seek any meaning in the number four, it is that of completeness and entirety; the square is closed from all sides, it is symmetrical and whole; and thus the fourfold parts of the priestly dress may point to its

חֹשֶׁן וְאֵפוֹד וּמְעִיל וּכְתֹנֶת תַּשְׁבֵּץ מִצְנֶפֶת וְאַבְנֵט וְעָשׂוּ בִגְדֵי־קֹדֶשׁ

perfection and completeness; the priest is *entirely clothed in holiness*; all worldly meditations, all profane feelings are banished, and the mind and the heart are exclusively directed to God and to sanctity. Hence are explicable phrases like: וילבש קללה כמדו: "he clothed himself with cursing like with his garment" (Psalm cix. 18); or וילבש בגדי נקם וכ׳: "he put on the garments of vengeance *for* clothing, and was clad with zeal as a cloke (Isa. lix. 17)."

The first of the priestly garments is the Tunic (כתנת). It was probably worn above the shirt, was a long close robe, without folds, covering the whole body, and reaching down to the feet, with sleeves; it was of linen (שש, or בד, xxxix. 27; Levit. vi. 3); and formed, no doubt, one whole, with an aperture at the upper part for the neck; it was woven (מעשה ארג, xxxix. 27), and, probably, as one entire piece, without the application of a needle; for this art of weaving whole garments was perfectly familiar to different ancient nations, and is, by Josephus, alluded to with regard to another part of the priestly dress. It is generally qualified by the epithet תשבץ, which means, most likely, *tessellated*, so that the forms of squares were interwoven in the garment; for שבץ signifies, in ver. 20, to set a gem in gold, and the setting, there alluded to, was, in all probability, square; the sexagonal form, which Maimonides supposes, like the cells of the ruminating beasts, is by no means plausible. The Septuagint renders, freely: *κοσυμβωτός*; the Vulgate, inaccurately, "angustus" (compare *Josephus*, Antiq. III. vii. 2). The purpose and meaning of this vestment is self-evident; it is of a white colour, which typifies purity; it is of fine linen or byssus, which is the emblem of religious sanctity (and Josephus asserts even, that כתנת means *linen*; so that it would be the linen garment *κατ' ἐξοχήν*; compare the same root in the kindred dialects, where it signifies also flax or linen); it is entire, to represent the priest as entirely clothed in purity and sanctity; it has the square ornaments interwoven, which point again to the completeness of this garment, which is undoubtedly the most important part of the priestly dress. Baehr calls it the "garment of salvation, of righteousness, of peace, of life, of heavenly light," and he arrives at these significations by the same specious deductions of which we have already given sufficient specimens.

II. Over the tunic the Girdle (אבנט) was tied. Although the girdle formed an indispensable part of the Oriental dress (see note on xii. 11), it is more especially the symbol of readiness, of office, and of appointment to some duties (Isaiah xxii. 21, etc.); and as the tunic of the priest (כתנת) was close and without folds, it was scarcely required to fasten it; and this is another reason which justifies us in assigning to the girdle a more internal meaning. It is, in fact, not designated with the usual names of חגור or אזור, but exclusively with אבנט. It was manufactured of linen, with blue and red and crimson, and was embroidered with figures (מעשה רקם), quite like the vail of the Court and Sanctuary, and it is thus sufficiently marked and characterised as belonging to the holy service. Josephus (*loc. cit.*) remarks: "The beginning of its circumvolution is at the breast; and when it has gone often round, it is there tied, and hangs loosely thence down to the ancles: I mean this, all the time the priest is not engaged in any laborious service, for in this position it appears in the most agreeable manner to the spectators; but when he is obliged to assist at offering sacrifices, and to do the appointed service, that he may not be hindered in his operations by its motion, he throws it to the left, and bears it on his shoulder" (compare Ezek. xliv. 18). According to tradition, the girdle was three fingers wide, and thirty-two cubits long. At present, Oriental girdles are about half a foot wide, and are still, as they were formerly, often an article of

make: a breast-plate, and an ephod, and a robe, and [1]a tesselated tunic, a mitre and a girdle; and they shall make holy garments for Aaron thy brother and his sons,

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Embroidered coat.

great luxury, covered with jewels and costly embroidery. It served frequently as a receptacle of the sword, writing-materials, and the purse. So important, and so specific a sign of the clerical office was the girdle considered, that, in later times, the priests were not permitted to wear it during their ordinary occupations, whilst this permission was granted them with regard to all other parts of the sacred dress.

III. The third part of the priestly garments is generally called BREECHES, which is, however, scarcely an adequate rendering of the Hebrew term מכנסים; this is derived from כנס, to gather, or to hide (Isaiah xxviii. 20), and is explained in the text as a garment "to cover the flesh of nakedness" (ver. 42: לכסות בשר ערוה), or simply, "to be on the flesh" (Lev. xvi. 4: ומכנסי בד יהיו על בשרו); they are further described to reach "from the loins to the thighs" (ממתנים עד ירכים; the מתנים begin at the lower part of the back; the ירכים never include the legs; compare Ezek. xliv. 18); and Josephus speaks of them in the following manner: "It is a girdle composed of fine twined linen, and is put about the privy parts; the feet are inserted into them, in the manner of breeches; but above half of it is cut off, and it ends at the thighs, and is there tied fast" (Antiq. III. vii. 1). The Rabbins assert that they reached to the knees, and were above the flanks fastened by ribbons; the Sept. renders περισκελῆ, and the Vulgate feminalia. From all this it is evident, that the מכנסים were rather a vesture intended to cover the *pudenda*, than breeches made for the whole lower part of the body. Breeches were, indeed, unnecessary for the priests; for 1. the close tunic (כתנת) prevented every possibility of accidental indecency, which was still more precluded 2. by the law, that no steps should lead up to the altar (xx. 26; see note there); and hence it is also obvious, that the מכנסים were more a symbol than a garment. But this typical meaning offers itself spontaneously by the consideration, that the flesh (ערוה בשר, σάρξ) is the emblem, not only of frailty and weakness, but of sensuality, of sin, and of worldly wishes; and the priest, in wearing the מכנסים over the pudenda (ערוה), which are preeminently the seat of carnal desires, was to be reminded of his spiritual duties, of sanctity and piety of life. Thus this part of the garments is in harmony with the significance of the whole priestly attire (see *Braun*, Vest. Sac. Hebr. ii. 343; *Baehr*, Symb. ii. 67, 80, *et seq.*).

IV. To complete the dress of the common priest a covering for the head was necessary, and this is called מגבעה, TURBAN. It was likewise of byssus, the usual material of the sacred dress; and as the head is the seat of reflection, it was especially required to show that it was likewise consecrated; the thoughts of the priests were to be hallowed, and all their ideas directed to the fountain of truth. Therefore the priests were expressly forbidden to uncover their heads (Lev. x. 6), for then one essential part of their holiness would have been wanting. In fact, the Orientals seem to have given to the covering of the head especially most significant shapes, many of which are still preserved on Egyptian monuments; even in Isaiah lix. 17, כובע ישועה, "a helmet of help" is mentioned. The form of the מגבעה is uncertain; we are only informed that it was fastened to the head by means of ribbons, to prevent its falling off (xxix. 9; Lev. viii. 13); the Sept. renders it κίδαρις; the Vulg. *tiara*, which is too indistinct. Josephus describes it thus: "Upon the head he wears a cap, not of a conical form (πῖλον ἄκωνον),

לְאַהֲרֹן אָחִיךָ וּלְבָנָיו לְכַהֲנוֹ־לִי׃ 5 וְהֵם יִקְחוּ אֶת־הַזָּהָב וְאֶת־
הַתְּכֵלֶת וְאֶת־הָאַרְגָּמָן וְאֶת־תּוֹלַעַת הַשָּׁנִי וְאֶת־הַשֵּׁשׁ׃ פ

nor encircling the whole head, but still covering more than half of it; it is called *Masnaemphthes*, Μασναεμφθής; and its make is such that it seems to be a crown, being made of thick swathes, but the contexture is of linen; and it is doubled round many times, and sewed together: besides which, a piece of fine linen covers the whole cap from the upper part, and reaches down to the forehead, and hides the seams of the swathes, which would otherwise appear indecently; this adheres close upon the solid part of the head, and is thereto so firmly fixed, that it may not fall off during the sacred service of the sacrifices" (Antiq. III. vii. 3). Whatever may be judged of this description of Josephus in general, it is obvious that he, in some respects at least, confounds the head-covering of the ordinary priests and of the High-priest; for one glance suffices to convince us that Μασναεμφθής is nothing but a corruption of מצנפת, which is the peculiar head-covering of the High-priest; and Baehr (Symb. ii. 64) adduces this justly as a proof, how cautious we ought to be in following Josephus, although himself a priest, in the description of the sacred garments, which might, in his time, have been considerably modified. It is unquestionable that the מגבעה of the common priest and the מצנפת of the High-priest were of different shapes; and the etymology leads us, with some probability, for the former, to גביע calyx (not גבען or גבעה, elevation), so that it had the form of the inversed calyx of a flower—a shape which was very popular, since flowers, in themselves frequently used for adorning the hair, were the emblems of light and enlightenment (whence they were also worked on the candlestick), and then of life and sanctity, and priestdom in general (compare כובע and קובע, helmet): and for the latter to צנף, to wind, to wrap round, so that it would be a turban; but probably higher than the מגבעה, as the greater dignity is in the East generally marked by a higher mitre; the king of Persia alone wore an erect tiara, which not even the highest officials were permitted to wear. But it is scarcely necessary to urge the *blooming* of the flowers too much, and to call the priests the "blooming servants of God" (Ps. xcii. 14), because they are the messengers of life (*Baehr*, *loc. cit.*, p. 79).—Very characteristic for the meaning of the head-covering is further the additional ornament on the מצנפת of the High-priest. A plate of gold (ציץ, Sept. and Philo, πέταλον; Vulg. lamina), frequently called נזר, *crown*, according to tradition two fingers wide, and probably only reaching from one temple to the other, was by means of a blue ribbon fastened on the mitre, but probably so that it was partly (but not entirely) on the forehead; on it the two most significant words were engraven: קדש ליהוה, Holiness to the Lord, that is, he who wears it is entirely devoted to God, and it is his misson to elevate the people to the same sanctity. The forehead is not only considered the mark of intelligence, but is also the most conspicuous part of the head; there the High-priest, who was himself the impersonification of the holy people, of the kingdom of priests, wore the diadem—the emblem of royalty—with that inscription, which condensed in two momentous words the whole end, the complete sum of the revealed religion. The plate of the mitre is, therefore, the culminating point of the whole pontifical attire; it mirrors forth, both in its form, and its material, and in the majestic words inscribed on it, the grand task of the High-priest, and through him of the Hebrew nation; and the original meaning of the Hebrew word, "shining or splendour" is, at the same time, intended to single out this ornament as that which is the brightest, the most striking of the High-priest's vesture.—

to initiate him to my office. 5. And they shall take [1] the gold, and the blue, and the red, and the crimson, and the

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Gold, and blue, and purple, and scarlet.

According to tradition both for the מגבעה and the מצנפת sixteen cubits of linen were applied.—As the description which Josephus gives of the מצנפת and ציץ varies in many points from the form to be inferred from the scriptural statements, we subjoin an extract of his remarks: "The High-priest's mitre was the same which we described before, and was wrought like that of all the other priests [but we must necessarily suppose a difference in the shape of the מגבעה and מצנפת]; above which there was another [?] with swathes of blue embroidered [?]; and round it [?] was a golden crown polished, of three rows [?], one above the other; out of which arose a cup of gold [?], which resembled the herb which we call *Saccharus*, but Greek botanists call it Hyoscyamus.... Of this was a crown made, as far as from the hinder part of the head to each of the temples [?]; but this *Ephielis*, for so this calyx may be called, did not cover the forehead, but it was covered with a golden plate, which had inscribed upon it the name of God in sacred characters." We cannot doubt the authenticity of this description of the mitre as regards the time of Josephus; but we are by no means justified in giving it preference over the Biblical statements for the Biblical times; and the learned efforts which have been made to reconcile the former with the latter, have necessarily proved unsuccessful. The sacred text makes no allusion whatever to a crown of flowers going from "the hinder part of the head to each of the temples"; a ribbon of blue (תכלת) was used to fasten the plate to the mitre (not three ribbons as several Rabbins believe, one at each side, and the third in the middle, going up the whole height of the mitre, and united with the former ones at the hinder part). No doubt the Hebrew designation of the plate (ציץ), which has also the meaning of flower, has given rise to that modification. It is even improbable that the word ציץ is intended to symbolize the same notions which the form of the מגבעה, as an inversed calyx, was calculated to call to the mind; such symbol was unnecessary in the mitre, as it contained these words themselves, which express more clearly than can be done by any emblem, the ideas of sanctity and religious life. To wear important, especially religious truths on the forehead, and thus openly to proclaim the confession of certain significant principles was a universal custom of the East, in which also the Mosaic precept concerning the phylacteries originated (see notes on xiii. 9; *Baehr*, Symb. ii. p. 143); and the High-priest, in wearing on his brow, the words: *Holiness to the Lord*, acknowledged the unlimited sovereignty of God, and identified his existence with the pursuit of holiness and righteousness.

These are the garments of the common priests. We have already remarked on iii. 5, that it was an almost universal practice, except, perhaps, among the Egyptians, not to enter holy places with covered feet, much less to perform in the temples or sanctuaries sacred functions. Both this fact, and the silence of the text, justify the supposition, that the Hebrew priests were also commanded to minister in the Tabernacle unshod; a fact which is unanimously confirmed by tradition. And this circumstance alone suffices to refute the assumption of many modern critics, that the sacred vestures were only intended to produce, by their costliness, a dazzling effect; for it is well known what degree of luxury was, by the Orientals, lavished on the adornment of their shoes and sandals; and a legislator, whose only end was pomp, would not have omitted to avail himself of that means to increase it. To the reasons adduced in the note on iii. 5, for that far-spread custom, we add one of Baehr, which is more plausible at first glance,

6 וְעָשׂוּ אֶת־הָאֵפֹד זָהָב תְּכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן תּוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי וְשֵׁשׁ מָשְׁזָר
מַעֲשֵׂה חֹשֵׁב׃ 7 שְׁתֵּי כְתֵפֹת חֹבְרֹת יִהְיֶה־לּוֹ אֶל־שְׁנֵי קְצוֹתָיו
וְחֻבָּר׃ 8 וְחֵשֶׁב אֲפֻדָּתוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָלָיו כְּמַעֲשֵׂהוּ מִמֶּנּוּ יִהְיֶה זָהָב
תְּכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן וְתוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי וְשֵׁשׁ מָשְׁזָר׃ 9 וְלָקַחְתָּ אֶת־שְׁתֵּי
אַבְנֵי־שֹׁהַם וּפִתַּחְתָּ עֲלֵיהֶם שְׁמוֹת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ 10 שִׁשָּׁה מִשְּׁמֹתָם
עַל הָאֶבֶן הָאֶחָת וְאֶת־שְׁמוֹת הַשִּׁשָּׁה הַנּוֹתָרִים עַל־הָאֶבֶן הַשֵּׁנִית

than on a more accurate examination. He believes, that, because shoes are intended to protect the feet from uncleanness, they seem to suppose that the person who wears them stands on an unclean place; and if he wishes, therefore, to intimate that he considers it pure or holy, and that he cannot defile himself on it, he takes off the shoes; if he approaches it with shoes, it would virtually be a declaration that he does not think it clean. However, this argument seems too artificial to be attributed to the unsophisticated minds of the ancient nations; and it is not in accordance with iii. 5, or Josh. v. 15. Being unshod was obviously considered a mark of humility and contrition; and hence mourners took off their sandals (2 Sam. xv. 30; see p. 47; Ezek. xxiv. 17, 23).—In the following verses, we shall explain the specific garments of the High-priest, except the mitre, which we were, by its close connection with the turban, obliged to anticipate in the preceding notes.

5. The workmen shall themselves receive the costly materials directly from the hands of the people; unlimited confidence was rested in their integrity, for they were men filled with the "spirit of wisdom," or, which is identical with it, penetrated "with the fear of God."

6—12. V. The Ephod (אפד) includes many characteristic points of the pontifical attire, and thereby manifests the internal character of the High-priest's office. 1. It was made of the work of the skilful weaver (מעשה חשב; see p. 510); and is thus, at once, discernible as appertaining to the Holy of Holies, the vail of which was of the same distinguished workmanship. The High-priest alone was allowed to enter into the immediate presence of the Ark of the Testimony; to the representative of the theocratical community alone could the privilege be granted of communing with the invisible King. A threefold climax in the workmanship is here obvious; the tunic was simply the work of the weaver (מעשה ארג); the girdle was the work of the embroiderer (מעשה רקם); whilst the ephod was prepared with the highest kind of texture (מעשה חשב). The Cherubim were not interwoven in the ephod, because they would have had no meaning in the garments of an official who did not represent the nearness of God, but who was only to prepare the people for it. But, 2. Besides the materials used for the vail of the Holy of Holies, gold threads were applied in the ephod, which, like the golden plate on the mitre, point to the sovereignty of the High-priest, who was the spiritual king of the nation; for gold is generally the emblem of regal power. The garments of the High-priest in general are called the "golden garments" (בגדי זהב); and, indeed, no part of them was without this metal. A shield of similar workmanship is described by Herodotus iii. 47; it was presented to the Lacedaemonians by the Egyptian king, Amasis. The ephod had no sleeves, and was to consist of two parts, called "shoulder-pieces" (כתפת), one of which covered the back, the other the breast and the upper part of the body. There, where they were united on the shoulders, two, probably square, onyx-

fine linen.—6. And they shall make the EPHOD *of* gold, blue, and red, crimson, and fine twined linen, *of* the work of the skilful weaver. 7. It shall have two shoulder-pieces joined at the two ends thereof, and *so* it shall be joined together. 8. And the [1]band of the ephod, which *is* upon it, shall be of the same workmanship, *and* of the same *piece*; *of* gold, blue, and red, and crimson, and fine twined linen. 9. And thou shalt take two onyx-stones, and thou shalt engrave on them the names of the children of Israel. 10. Six of their names on the one stone, and the remaining six names on the second stone, according to

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Curious girdle.

stones, set in gold, were to be fixed, on which the names of the twelve tribes of Israel were to be engraved, six on each stone, according to the age (כתולדתם); and the High-priest was to wear these stones as "stones of memorial" (אבני זכרן) for the children of Israel, when he stood before God. The significance of this arrangement is self-evident. The High-priest represented Israel before God; the stones were, therefore, for the people, who saw them and their names engraved on them, a memorial that the High-priest officiated in their name; that he interceded in their favour; that he strove to expiate their sins and to reconcile them with their Creator, from whom they had swerved by their transgressions. The stones with the names on them were, therefore, for every individual an earnest admonition to render himself, by repentance and atonement, worthy of that reconciliation; for the prayers and the sacrifices of the High-priest are efficacious only in so far as the people itself shows a craving after the restoration of that blissful harmony.—Less appropriate are the explanations, that the stones are a memorial to recall to God the memory of the piety of Israel and of the merits of the patriarchs; or that they are to remind Aaron, that he stands before God in the name of the twelve tribes; this latter conviction was incessantly impressed upon Aaron's mind by the whole nature of his office, and by the character of his functions. It is the opinion of Baehr, that the shoulder stands in significant relation with the meaning of the ephod; for this garment consisted of two "shoulder-pieces"; the stones were to be fixed on the shoulder; the ephod might, indeed, be called a "shoulder-garment"; and is thus designated by the Septuagint, Josephus, Philo (ἐπωμίς), and the Vulgate (superhumerale); and, as the shoulder is frequently considered as a type of government (compare Isa. ix. 5; xxii. 22), the ephod is properly the regal robe, symbolizing the supreme authority of the High-priest.

But this exposition is closely connected with the whole manner in which the pontifical garments are viewed by Baehr; he divides them into three parts, those which represent the law, those which point to royalty, and those which typify the priestdom of Aaron; and he attributes to the first class the robe with its ornaments; to the second, the ephod and the breastplate, whilst he believes those garments which the High-priest has in common with the ordinary priests, to belong to the third kind. In this classification the whole character of Baehr's criticism is concentrated; it shows both its great excellencies and its greater defects; for whilst he proposes ideas which are in perfect harmony with the sublime spirit of Mosaism, he tries to find them where they are evi-

כְּתוֹלְדֹתָם׃ 11 מַעֲשֵׂה חָרַשׁ אֶבֶן פִּתּוּחֵי חֹתָם תְּפַתַּח אֶת־שְׁתֵּי
הָאֲבָנִים עַל־שְׁמֹות בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מֻסַבֹּת מִשְׁבְּצוֹת זָהָב תַּעֲשֶׂה
אֹתָם׃ 12 וְשַׂמְתָּ אֶת־שְׁתֵּי הָאֲבָנִים עַל כִּתְפֹת הָאֵפֹד אַבְנֵי
זִכָּרֹן לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְנָשָׂא אַהֲרֹן אֶת־שְׁמוֹתָם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה עַל־שְׁתֵּי
כְתֵפָיו לְזִכָּרֹן׃ ס שני 13 וְעָשִׂיתָ
מִשְׁבְּצֹת זָהָב׃ 14 וּשְׁתֵּי שַׁרְשְׁרֹת זָהָב טָהוֹר מִגְבָּלֹת תַּעֲשֶׂה

dently not expressed; he erects a system, where there is scarcely a basis for argumentation; and he works out, by sagacious combinations and deductions, a continuous chain, where there is hardly a commencing link. He makes the expression "kingdom of priests" (ממלכת כהנים), the corner-stone of the theory; and hence he infers that the Israelites possess three crowns: that of the law (ברית), of priestdom, and of royalty. But this division is nowhere found in the Old Testament; it is proposed and developed in Rabbinical writings, and in the phrase ממלכת כהנים, the stress lies on כהנים, not on ממלכת, which means there "community" in general.

The "shoulder" is a natural symbol of eminence and elevation; that which is worn on the shoulders is conspicuous, visible to all; therefore the holy vessels were, during the journeys of the Israelites, carried on the shoulders; the Hebrew word שכם means also a high, mountainous tract of land; and the town Shechem (שכם) has its name from its elevated position in Mount Ephraim. Now the whole ephod was only intended as a garment for the two onyx stones with the names of the twelve tribes, just as the ark was only made in order to receive the Tables of the Law, or the shew-bread table for the shew-bread; the whole end and tendency of the ephod is comprised in the concluding words: "and Aaron shall bear their names before the Lord, upon his two shoulders for a memorial" (ver. 12); and as those stones and the names were to remind Israel of the duties of self-examination and repentance, they were appropriately worn on the shoulders, where they were prominently visible to all. It requires, at present, scarcely any proof to show the great antiquity of the art of engraving (פתח; חרש אבן, ver. 11). That it was familiar to the ancient Indians, Ethiopians, and Egyptians, is indubitable; both in seals and in rings figures and words were engraved; and several specimens have been discovered dating from very remote periods (Gen. xxxviii. 18; xli. 42; *Wilkinson*, Manners and Customs, iii. 373, *et seq.*). Pliny's remark (xxxiii 6): "Non signat Oriens aut Aegyptus etiam nunc, literis contenta solis," is, therefore inaccurate (compare *Hengstenb.* Mos. and Eg. p. 139). Equally popular and ancient is the art of setting precious stones (שבץ; משבצות זהב, ver. 11); and many articles of gold, inlaid with jewels, have been found in Egypt. About אבן שהם, onyx-stone, see *infra*, p. 538.

4. The ephod, in order to remain close to the body, required a girdle, and it is commanded that this girdle shall be of the same costly materials as the ephod itself, and that it shall form one whole with it, or that it shall be woven out of the same piece (וחשב אפדתו אשר עליו כמעשהו ממנו יהיה, ver. 8); we must, therefore, assume, that a band was annexed on either side of the ephod, probably more on the lower part (חֵשֶׁב is indeed *girdle*, as is obvious from xxix. 5; Levit. viii. 7; etc., not *texture;* and אפדה is the abstract of אפוד, the root of which signifies itself *to gird;* the differing explanations proposed, for instance those of the Septuagint, Vulgate, Clericus, and

their birth. 11. *With* the work of the engraver in stone, *like* the engravings of a signet, shalt thou engrave the two stones, according to the names of the children of Israel; thou shalt make them set in sockets of gold. 12. And thou shalt put the two stones upon the shoulders of the ephod *for* stones of memorial to the children of Israel; and Aaron shall bear their names before the Lord upon his two shoulders for a memorial.—13. And thou shalt make sockets of gold; 14. And two chains [1]of pure gold

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—At the ends; of wreathen-work.

Dathe, are therefore erroneous; Onkelos translates well: המין תקוניה די עלוהי).—Josephus describes the ephod thus: "It resembles the Epomis of the Greeks. It was made in the following manner: it was woven to the depth of a cubit, of several colours, with gold intermixed, but embroidered; but it left the middle of the breast uncovered; it was made with sleeves also; nor did it appear to be at all differently made from a short coat. There were also two sardonyxes upon the ephod, at the shoulders, to fasten it, in the nature of buttons, having each end running to the sardonyxes of gold that they might be buttoned by them. On these were engraven the names of the sons of Jacob, in the letters of our own country, and in our own tongue, six on each of the stones, on either side; and the elder sons' names were on the right shoulder" [compare *Talmud*, Sot. 36; Rashi, on ver. 10]. In these statements two points seem to disagree with the description of the text: *a.* The ephod had certainly no sleeves; those of the tunic alone, which were of the characteristic priestly material, fine linen, and contained the significant squares in their texture, covered the arms of the High-priest; and, *b.* It is improbable that the ephod left a void in the middle of the breast, to insert there the breast-plate (חשן), as Josephus continues; for thereby the ephod would not only have lost its wholeness, which it was intended to preserve, even by weaving the girdle on it, but the breastplate could scarcely be called, with propriety, the "breastplate of the ephod" (חשן האפד) if its place was not on the ephod itself. We will not omit to add what the same writer remarks on the use and efficacy of the two onyxes of the ephod: "As to those stones which the High-priest bore on his shoulders.... the one of them shone when God was present at their sacrifices; I mean that which was in the nature of a button on his right shoulder, bright rays darting out thence, and being seen even by those who were very remote, which splendour yet was not before natural to the stone. This has appeared a wonderful thing to those who have not so far indulged themselves in philosophy as to despise Divine Revelation." Josephus mentions a similar miraculous intervention with respect to the Urim and Thummim, which we shall notice in due place; but he confesses that he has never himself witnessed that wonder, "for," says he, "that supernatural shining ceased two hundred years before I composed this book [that is, since John Hyrcanus], God having been displeased at the transgression of His laws" (Antiq. III. viii. 9).—It is known, that later the common priests also wore ephods, but merely of linen, whence they are called אפד בד (1 Sam. ii. 18; xxii. 18; 2 Sam. vi. 14).

14—30. VI. THE BREAST-PLATE (חשן), which was of the same skilful work as the ephod (מעשה חשב, ver. 15), and of the same costly materials, is the uppermost of the pontifical garments, and must, therefore, necessarily be smaller than the

אֹתָם מַעֲשֵׂה עֲבֹת וְנָתַתָּה אֶת־שַׁרְשְׁרֹת הָעֲבֹתֹת עַל־
הַמִּשְׁבְּצֹת׃ ס 15 וְעָשִׂיתָ חֹשֶׁן מִשְׁפָּט מַעֲשֵׂה
חֹשֵׁב כְּמַעֲשֵׂה אֵפֹד תַּעֲשֶׂנּוּ זָהָב תְּכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן וְתוֹלַעַת שְׁנִי וְשֵׁשׁ
מָשְׁזָר תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתוֹ׃ 16 רָבוּעַ יִהְיֶה כָּפוּל זֶרֶת אָרְכּוֹ וְזֶרֶת
רָחְבּוֹ׃ 17 וּמִלֵּאתָ בוֹ מִלֻּאַת אֶבֶן אַרְבָּעָה טוּרִים אָבֶן טוּר

ephod, which it was intended to cover only on one part, namely, "on the heart" (vers. 29, 30). Its dimensions are stated at one span (זרת = half a cubit) in length, and one span in breadth; but as it was to be doubled and square (רבוע כפול, ver. 16), it was, in fact, two spans long, and one span wide, half of the length being turned back, so that it had the form of a bag open everywhere except at the nether side. In order to join the two parts at the upper side, two rings were fixed at the two ends (ver. 28). But these rings served at the same time, to fasten the breast-plate to the ephod; for two chains (שרשרת, ver. 14, or, שרשת, ver. 22) of wreathen work (מגבלת, ver. 14, or, גבלת, ver. 22; Septuagint, κροσσοὺς συμπεπλεγμένους), or, more distinctly, twisted of gold-threads in the manner of ropes (מעשה עבת, *ibid.*), were put into them, and then passed into the ouches or sockets of the two onyx-stones on the shoulders of the ephod (vers. 24, 25); and, in order to prevent every loosing of the breast-plate, two other rings were fixed under it over the border (ver. 26), and two more on the ephod near the places whence the girdle issued (ver. 27); and then a ribbon of blue (תכלת) was passed from the rings of the breast-plate through those of the ephod, so that the former was tied (רכס) to the latter, and a moving from its place was impossible. Thus, it is unquestionable, that the ephod and the breast-plate were intended to form one whole, which unity is symbolized by the wreathen, rope-like chains of gold, whilst the latter four rings, with the blue ribbon, were necessarily required if both vestures should in all parts be equally close to each other. But it would be artificial to seek in this unity a hidden typical meaning, as, for instance, Baehr has endeavoured to discover. He believes, that the ephod and breast-plate together represent the royalty of the High-priest, but so that the former is an emblem of government, the latter of jurisdiction, which two functions were, in ancient monarchies, united in the person of the sovereign. However, the sacred text urges, with regard to the Tabernacle, more than once, that it should be considered as *one*, or, as a whole, which implies the idea that no part is superfluous or unmeaning. The connection of the ephod and breast-plate recall the same notion; the pontifical attire was to be viewed as *one*, as serving to illustrate, in all its parts, the same principles and truths which were the end of the whole priestdom and its official duties; and that unity was appropriately indicated by the open and striking connection of the two uppermost parts of the vesture.

But, as the distinguishing characteristic of the breast-plate, it is commanded that twelve precious stones, in four equal rows, were to be set on it, and that on each stone the name of one of the twelve tribes of Israel should be engraven. Nothing represents both the origin and destiny of man in a more striking and more beautiful manner than precious stones carefully worked out. Like the jewel, man is a child of the earth; but as this earthly frame encloses the breath of God and an eternal soul, it is a *precious* treasure in the eyes of God (Ps. cxvi. 15); He values man as bearing His image, and His indelible impress. But it is the aim of man to train himself from a creature of

shalt thou make of wreathen work, twisted in the manner of ropes, and thou shalt put the wreathen chains into the sockets.—15. And thou shalt make the BREASTPLATE [1] OF DECISION *with* the work of the skilful weaver, like the work of the ephod shalt thou make it; *of* gold, blue, and red, and crimson, and fine twined linen, shalt thou make it. 16. It shall be square *and* doubled; one span *shall be* its length, and one span its breadth. 17. And thou shalt set in it settings of stones, four rows of stones: the row of

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Of judgment.

the earth into a denizen of heaven, to commute the gloom and heaviness inherent in matter into the aerial brightness which is the essence of the spirits; and the smiling splendour of the precious stones, which are, like him, taken from the same dark womb of the common mother, symbolize to him that internal regeneration, that ascending from earth to heaven, from impurity to purity, from worldliness to sanctity, which is the innermost tendency of the Mosaic dispensation. But, further, the jewels are, among all ancient nations, regarded as the foci of light, as the eyes of the earth; they are the emblems of the stars, which they rival in splendour; their brilliancy recalls the brightness of heaven; and if the names of the tribes were engraven on twelve stones, the hosts of Israel were reminded to strive after the *light* and the *purity* of the heavenly hosts.—If, therefore, the precious stones on the breast-plate were deeply significant we may conclude that the individual jewels for the different tribes had also a specific meaning. The more must we deplore the great uncertainty which prevails with regard to the identity of those gems. The ancient translators and commentators already differ widely in rendering and explaining them; and the kindred dialects offer, just in this instance, very little assistance. We have here endeavoured to compile a concise survey of the different conjectures proposed; that meaning which we have placed first, has, in our opinion, the greatest relative probability.

I.—THE FIRST ROW.

1. אֹדֶם, CARNELIAN. The etymology (from אדם, to be red) facilitates the identification of this gem; the Targumim, therefore, like the Samaritan and Syriac translations, in rendering סמקן (from סמק, to be red), have well preserved the derivation; and the interpretation of the Septuagint, Josephus, and Vulgate, by *σάρδιον* and "sardius," lead, likewise, to a gem of that colour. For the sardius, which received this name because it was first discovered in Sardis, although the sardius of Arabia and Babylon was of superior quality (*Plin.*, Hist. Nat. xxxvii. 7), is nearly related to the carnelian, to which this designation was given because its colour is similar to that of raw flesh (caro); but, when held between the eye and the light, it appears of a deep blood-red; and its value depended on the degree of vividness which its red colour displayed. It is a variety of chalcedony, and belongs, therefore, to the flint family. It possesses a considerable degree of hardness, but is capable of being polished and cut; and the ancients engraved more frequently on it than, perhaps, on any other stone. A fine dark-red carnelian, called *El-Akik*, is found in Yemen, near the town Damar; it is much worn by the Arabians as an ornament, on the fingers, arms, or on the girdle; and it is believed to stop the flux of blood, if applied to a fresh wound. And here we may remark, that, in the opinion of Ebn Ezra, every gem used for the breast-plate possesses some hidden virtue for

אֹדֶם פִּטְדָה וּבָרֶקֶת הַטּוּר הָאֶחָד׃ 18 וְהַטּוּר הַשֵּׁנִי נֹפֶךְ סַפִּיר
וְיָהֲלֹם׃ 19 וְהַטּוּר הַשְּׁלִישִׁי לֶשֶׁם שְׁבוֹ וְאַחְלָמָה׃ 20 וְהַטּוּר

healing a disease, either of the body or of the soul. Excellent specimens of carnelian are also found in Surat, a considerable town near the gulf of Cambay, in the north-western shores of India. Those discovered in Hindostan are first exposed to the sun for several weeks, then heated in earthen pots, and thus they assume that lively red colour to which they owe their Hebrew name.—Others translate אֹדֶם, less probably, *carbuncle* (so Gr. Venet., ἄνθραξ, the Pers. Vers., Saadiah), or *garnet* (Abarbanel).

2. פִּטְדָה, Topaz, is, on account of its frequency in Ethiopia, also called *the topaz of Cush* (פטדת כוש) in Job xxvii. 19, from which passage it is evident how highly the Hebrews prized it. It has its name, probably, from the root *pita*, which signifies, in Sanscrit, *pale*. For the topaz is generally pale and yellowish, sometimes quite colourless, but not unfrequently greenish, wherefore Onkelos renders ירקן (from ירק, green). Its dark shade passes sometimes over into carnation red, sometimes into lilac; whilst the pale shade passes into greyish, tincal, and celadon green. The Septuagint and Josephus translate τοπάζιον, τόπαζος; which word is, perhaps, formed from the Hebrew פטדה by inversion of the letters. It is found in alluvial strata, and occurs in rhombic prisms. According to some ancient, mostly fabulous, accounts, it was especially obtained in the small island Topazos, in the Red Sea; which region is included in the term כוש (*Plin.* xxxvii. 8; *Diod.* iii. 39; *Strab.* xvi. 4; *Gesen.* Thes. p. 1101). It has been asserted, that the topaz of the ancients is our chrysolite; but it is, in all probability, identical with our gem of the same name (*Bellermann*, Urim and Thummim, p. 39).

3. בָּרֶקֶת or בָּרְקַת (Ezek. xxviii. 13), Smaragd. It is derived from ברק, to send lightning, and denotes, therefore, a stone of a bright coruscant colour; the Septuagint and Josephus render σμάραγδος; the Vulgate, smaragdus; which may, etymologically, be kindred to ברקת. It is a sort of precious corundum, of strong glass-lustre, a beautiful green colour, with many degrees of shade; it is pellucid, and causes a double refraction. Pliny enumerates twelve species of this stone (*Rosenm.*, Alterth. IV. i. 34). It is not rare in Egypt.

II.—The Second Row.

4. נֹפֶךְ, perhaps, Carbuncle; for Josephus renders ἄνθραξ, which means, "live coal," that is, carbunculus; and Targum Jerusalem כרכדנא, that is, carchedonius or carbuncle. It is of a deep red colour, with a mixture of scarlet. That name comprises several shining stones, of the flint family, which, especially if held up to the sun, lose their deep tinge and assume entirely the colour of a burning coal; to this class belong the ruby, the garnet, spinel, and chiefly the Almandin, that is, the noble Oriental garnet, which is transparent, red, with a violet shade, and a strong vitreous lustre (see *Rosenm.*, *loc. cit.*). The carbuncle is usually found pure, of an angular shape, and adhering to a heavy ferruginous stone of the emery kind (*Encyc.*).

5. סַפִּיר, Sapphire; see note on xxiv. 10. The principal colour is blue, generally with a double refraction; some sapphires give forth a starry lustre with six rays on two opposite corners; they are called star-sapphires, and are considered peculiarly precious.

6. יָהֲלֹם, perhaps, Emerald. The etymology (from הלם, to beat, to strike) leads us to suppose a hard stone. The emerald, which is of a green colour, of various depths, is nearly as hard as the topaz, and stands next to the ruby in value. It is found in Peru and India. The Septuagint and Josephus understand ὀνύχιον; others, with still less probability, jasper, which is unquestionably the last of the twelve stones on the High-priest's breast-plate; others, diamond; but it is

[1]carnelian, topaz, and [2]smaragd, *shall be* the first row. 18. And the second row *shall be* [3]carbuncle, sapphire, and [4]emerald. 19. And the third row, ligure, agate, and amethyst. 20. And the fourth row, [5]chrysolite, and onyx,

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Sardius. [2] Carbuncle. [3] Emerald. [4] Diamond. [5] Beryl.

more than doubtful whether the art of engraving on it was known to the ancients, who did not even understand how to cut the ruby.

III. The Third Row.

7. לֶשֶׁם Ligure (Sept. λιγύριον or λυγκούριον, Vulg. ligurius), so called because it was first imported from Liguria, in northern Italy, is a variety of the hyacinth, which, like all minerals belonging to the family of Zircon, occurs in square prisms with pyramidal terminations. That the ligure is identical with the hyacinth is also confirmed by Epiphanius. It is transparent, red passing into yellow, quartzy, vitreous, harder than smaragd, and loses its colour in the fire. Sometimes it is brownish and green.

8. שְׁבוֹ, Agate (Sept. ἀχάτης, Vulg. achates) is said to have been first discovered on the shores of the river Achates in Sicily, and hence to have received its name; but according to Bochart it is to be traced to the Punic and Hebrew root נקד=עקד, which means in passive, to be spotted (Gen. xxx. 35, etc.). It stood, in ancient times, in very high estimation, but gradually lost its value (Achates in magna fuit auctoritate, nunc in nulla, says *Pliny*). It is a semi-pellucid, uncrystallized variety of quartz, is found in parallel or concentric layers of various colours, and presents different tints in the same specimen. The colours are finely arranged in stripes or bands; and hence we distingush fortification agate, when those lines are in angular shapes, and resemble the design of a fortification, the Scotch pebble belongs to this species; and moss agate, when they are in mossy threads. The ancient artists, who used the agate very frequently for rings, seals, cups, and many other purposes, skilfully employed those natural lines for the various figures which they intended to represent. This was still more facilitated by the circumstance, that, in fact, the agate is generally a compound or mixed stone, consisting of quartz, chalcedony, carnelian, flint, jasper, etc., so that mostly two sorts of stone are united in the agate; and hence it has very various colours, with very different lines and spots, which form sometimes complete figures.

9. אַחְלָמָה Amethyst (Septuag. and Epiphan. ἀμέθυστος, Vulg. amethystus). The Hebrew word is, according to some expositors, derived from חלם, to dream, because it was believed, that it caused dreams to those who wore it (*Kimchi*, sub voc.), whilst the Greek name was given to this stone from its supposed efficiency in protecting the wearer from intoxication (ἀ-μεθύω); but Pliny (xxxvii. 9) mentions the opinion, that it was so designated because it imitates the colour of wine without reaching it. The amethyst is a sub-species of quartz; it is generally bluish violet of different degrees of intensity, but those of the East are sometimes deep red. The ancients knew five species, whilst, in modern times, two varieties are distinguished: the Oriental and Occidental amethyst; the former is by far harder and more precious than the latter. The best amethysts are found in India, Arabia, and Armenia; they occur generally in crystallized forms, in hexahedral prisms terminated by corresponding pyramids. Pliny calls them sculpturae faciles; and they were, indeed, very extensively wrought into rings, seals, and cameos.

IV. The Fourth Row.

10. תַּרְשִׁישׁ Chrysolite (Septuagint, χρυσόλιθος). It owes its Hebrew name to the circumstance that it was first found in Tartessus, that ancient city in Spain between the two mouths of the river

הָרְבִיעִי תַּרְשִׁישׁ וְשֹׁהַם וְיָשְׁפֵה מְשֻׁבָּצִים זָהָב יִהְיוּ בְּמִלּוּאֹתָם׃
21 וְהָאֲבָנִים תִּהְיֶיןָ עַל־שְׁמֹת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה עַל־שְׁמֹתָם
פִּתּוּחֵי חוֹתָם אִישׁ עַל־שְׁמוֹ תִּהְיֶיןָ לִשְׁנֵי עָשָׂר שָׁבֶט׃ 22 וְעָשִׂיתָ
עַל־הַחֹשֶׁן שַׁרְשֹׁת גַּבְלֻת מַעֲשֵׂה עֲבֹת זָהָב טָהוֹר׃ 23 וְעָשִׂיתָ
עַל־הַחֹשֶׁן שְׁתֵּי טַבְּעוֹת זָהָב וְנָתַתָּ אֶת־שְׁתֵּי הַטַּבָּעוֹת עַל־שְׁנֵי
קְצוֹת הַחֹשֶׁן׃ 24 וְנָתַתָּה אֶת־שְׁתֵּי עֲבֹתֹת הַזָּהָב עַל־שְׁתֵּי הַטַּבָּעֹת
אֶל־קְצוֹת הַחֹשֶׁן׃ 25 וְאֵת שְׁתֵּי קְצוֹת שְׁתֵּי הָעֲבֹתֹת תִּתֵּן עַל־
שְׁתֵּי הַמִּשְׁבְּצוֹת וְנָתַתָּה עַל־כִּתְפוֹת הָאֵפֹד אֶל־מוּל פָּנָיו׃ 26 וְעָשִׂיתָ
שְׁתֵּי טַבְּעוֹת זָהָב וְשַׂמְתָּ אֹתָם עַל־שְׁנֵי קְצוֹת הַחֹשֶׁן עַל־שְׂפָתוֹ
אֲשֶׁר אֶל־עֵבֶר הָאֵפוֹד בָּיְתָה׃ 27 וְעָשִׂיתָ שְׁתֵּי טַבְּעוֹת זָהָב
וְנָתַתָּה אֹתָם עַל־שְׁתֵּי כִתְפוֹת הָאֵפוֹד מִלְּמַטָּה מִמּוּל פָּנָיו
לְעֻמַּת מַחְבַּרְתּוֹ מִמַּעַל לְחֵשֶׁב הָאֵפוֹד׃ 28 וְיִרְכְּסוּ אֶת־הַחֹשֶׁן

Baetis (Guadalquiver). The Chrysolite is usually green, but with different degrees of shade; it is generally transparent, but often only translucent; in hardness it yields to quartz, but surpasses glass; it occurs sometimes in crystals, sometimes in round pieces, sometimes in small shapeless pieces. Luther renders this gem *turkois*, a conjecture based only on the similarity with the Hebrew name; but it is certainly not *amber*, or *topaz*, as others have proposed.

11. שֹׁהַם Onyx (Sept. in Job, Theod. and others, ὄνυξ) is so called because its color resembles that of the human flesh under the nails. It is a kind of chalcedony of different colours, with stripes horizontally arranged; and parallel layers, used for making cameos. It was imported from the land of Havilah (Gen. ii. 12); was considered of great value (Job xxviii. 26), and formed an important article of commerce (Ezek. xxviii. 13). Josephus, Aquila, Luther, and others render *sardonyx*, which is nearly kindred to the *onyx*, but was, by the ancients, considered of peculiar value (*Juv.* xiii.; *Pliny*, Hist. Nat. xxxvii. 1). The Septuagint in the Pentateuch, the Syriac translation, the Targumim, Saadiah, and many modern critics render *beryl* (βηρύλλιον), which is of a pale, sea-green colour (Sept. in Gen. ii. 12: λίθος ὁ πράσινος, that is, χρυσόπρασος, the "leek-green stone"). But it is scarcely *sapphire*, or *ruby*, or *smaragd*.

12. יָשְׁפֵה Jasper (the same in Arabic; either derived from שפה, to be smooth; or from שפה=ישף and צפה, to shine, Sept. ἴασπις). The Oriental jasper is generally of a bright green colour; sometimes clouded with white, or spotted with red or yellow; and was very highly prized. It belongs to the quartz family, and is found in numerous varieties. The Egyptian jasper, which is found loose in the sand, is brown, of various shades, disposed in concentric stripes, alternately with black lines. It is frequently used for ornaments.

The same twelve stones are mentioned in xxxix. 10—13, and Rev. xxi. 19—20,

and jasper: they shall be mounted with gold in their settings. 21. And the stones shall be [1]according to the names of the children of Israel, twelve; according to their names, *like* the engravings of a signet; every one according to its name shall there be, for the twelve tribes. 22. And thou shalt make on the breast-plate chains of wreathen work, twisted in the manner of ropes, *of* pure gold. 23. And thou shalt make upon the breast-plate two rings of gold, and shalt put the two rings upon the two ends of the breast-plate. 24. And thou shalt put the two wreathen *chains* of gold in the two rings *which are* on the ends of the breast-plate. 25. And *the other* two ends of the two wreathen *chains* thou shalt fasten in the two sockets, and put *them* on the shoulder-pieces of the ephod before it. 26. And thou shalt make two rings of gold, and thou shalt put them upon the two ends of the breast-plate in the border thereof, which *is* in the side of the ephod inward. 27. And thou shalt make two *other* rings of gold, and thou shalt put them upon the two shoulder-pieces of the ephod underneath, towards the forepart thereof, over against its joining, above the band of the ephod. 28. And they shall fasten the breast-plate by its rings to the rings of the ephod with a ribbon of blue, that

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—With.

where they are named as the foundations of the splendid pillars for the walls of the new Jerusalem; and nine of them are introduced in Ezek. xxviii. 3, in the description of the splendour of the king of Tyre (לשם, שבו and אחלמה are omitted). It is still customary to make a sort of rings, studded with those twelve stones, which are called the stones of the twelve months, or of health (*Bellermann*, Ur. and Thum. p.34).—The order, in which the stones with their respective names were arranged on the breast-plate, was probably, as Josephus, Rashi, and others believe, according to the age of the children of Jacob, as on the ephod (see ver. 10); so that they followed each other in the following manner, the three stones of each row being of course arranged from right to left:

I. 1. Carnelian (*Reuben*).
2. Topaz (*Simeon*).
3. Smaragd (*Levi*).
II. 4. Carbuncle (*Judah*).
5. Sapphire (*Dan*).
6. Emerald (*Naphthali*).
III. 7. Ligure (*Gad*).
8. Agate (*Asher*).
9. Amethyst (*Issachar*).
IV. 10. Chrysolite (*Zebulun*).
11. Onyx (*Joseph*).
12. Jasper (*Benjamin*).

It is less probable, that the names were arranged according to the mothers (first the sons of Leah and Bilhah, and then those of Silpah and Rachel) or in

מִטַּבְּעֹתָו אֶל־טַבְּעֹת הָאֵפוֹד בִּפְתִיל תְּכֵלֶת לִהְיוֹת עַל־חֵשֶׁב
הָאֵפוֹד וְלֹא־יִזַּח הַחֹשֶׁן מֵעַל הָאֵפוֹד׃ 29 וְנָשָׂא אַהֲרֹן אֶת־
שְׁמוֹת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּחֹשֶׁן הַמִּשְׁפָּט עַל־לִבּוֹ בְּבֹאוֹ אֶל־הַקֹּדֶשׁ
לְזִכָּרֹן לִפְנֵי־יְהוָה תָּמִיד׃ 30 וְנָתַתָּ אֶל־חֹשֶׁן הַמִּשְׁפָּט אֶת־

ס מטבעתיו קרי

the order of the encampment (I. Judah, Issachar, Zebulun; II. Reuben, Simeon, Gad; III. Ephraim, Manasseh, Benjamin; IV. Dan, Asher, Naphthali).

30. The Urim and Thummim.—One of the obscurest subjects connected with the holy service and the functions of the High-priest, is the nature of that part of the breast-plate which our text calls *Urim and Thummim*. Almost innumerable are the conjectures hazarded on this point, but we shall here, as it is our constant principle in all cases, take the sacred records as our only guide, fully convinced that this is the only possible manner of arriving at a well-established conclusion.

1. Our verse commands, to put on, or to, the breast-plate (ונתת אל־חשן), the Urim and Thummim (את האורים ואת התמים). It is necessary to observe, that the preposition אל admits, quite unforcedly, the interpretation, that the Urim and Thummim were *externally* fixed to the breast-plate; the circumstance, that in xxv. 16, the phrase נתן אל signifies to put one thing *into* another, does not compel us to understand it in the same manner in all other passages. The reason that it would have been improper to expose that holy object to the public gaze, and thus, as it were to profane it, is untenable; for the Holy was accessible to every priest; the vail before the Holy of Holies contained the images of the sacred Cherubim in "the work of the skilful weaver" (מעשה חשב), that is, so that they were visible on both sides; and thus every priest had permission and opportunity of seeing those mysterious symbols of the Divine presence. Why should it be forbidden to behold the Urim and Thummim of the High-priest? Were not those two sublime words קדש ליהוה, conspicuously visible on the plate of his mitre? and as the High-priest wore his garments only in the Tabernacle (בבאו לפני יי'), and deposited them, after the performance of his functions, in a cell appropriated for this purpose (Ezek. xliv. 19), how was a profanation possible?

2. In ver. 17, it is enjoined, that "settings of stones shall be set on the breast-plate" (ומלאת בו וכ'). It is clear, beyond a doubt, that these stones also formed an ornament on the exterior surface of the breast-plate. Scarcely any critic of note has asserted that the costly stones with the names of the tribes skilfully engraven on them were hidden between the two halves of the breast-plate. Now, it is very difficult to conceive what relative position the Urim and Thummin, and the gems, occupied on the breast-plate; the sacred text, which is so minute in describing even the very rings and ribbons, cannot be supposed to be so markedly deficient in a very essential and important point.

3. We are, therefore, necessarily compelled *to consider the Urim and Thummim identical with the precious stones*; and the thirtieth verse is therefore a more specified qualification, or an epexegesis, to the seventeenth. That this is not against the genius of the Biblical style requires scarcely any proof. Our verse concludes the whole and detailed description of the breast-plate, and it is perfectly appropriate that it should contain a brief summary of the preceding exposition. It is obvious that it is, in this respect, quite analogous to ver. 12, where the end and nature of the ephod are similarly comprised in a few characteristic words. In giving to our verse this meaning, we do by no means attribute to the scriptural style "every possible perversity," as some critics have cried out, in an outburst of affected indignation, which they find it

it may be above the band of the ephod, and that the breast-plate be not losed from the ephod. 29. And Aaron shall bear the names of the children of Israel on the breast-plate of decision upon his heart, when he goeth into the holy *place*, for a memorial before the Lord continually. 30. And thou shalt put on the breast-plate of decision the

convenient to parade in lieu of arguments. In fact, our verse is not even superfluous after the seventeenth. In the latter, the principal stress lies on the manner in which the stones were to be prepared and arranged: they were to be set in four rows, in a certain fixed order, whilst, in our verse, it is prescribed that they were to be fastened on the breast-plate, that Aaron was to wear them on his heart, and that they had a certain significant relation with the people of Israel. We could mention many passages in which the style is by far more irregular; we refer only to xxv. 24, 25, where the זר זהב is twice introduced, in a manner, that many believed, that two wreaths are prescribed for the shew-bread table, although, in fact, one only was commanded; to vi. 10—30, and x. 28—xi. 8, where the arrangement of the ideas is so unusual that even orthodox commentators suspected these passages to be a spurious aggregate of incoherent fragments. But we have, in the notes on those passages, endeavoured to vindicate their authenticity. In Levit. viii. 8, where all the parts of the pontifical robes are enumerated, the Urim and Thummim alone are mentioned, not the precious stones; and this is a stronger proof of the identity of both than many are willing to admit (compare xxxix. 8—21).

4. It would be strange indeed, that the sacred text should have left us in perfect ignorance concerning the character of the Urim and Thummim, which, as we shall presently see, were intended for a very remarkable purpose. It is generally averred, that that silence is intentional; that the nature and application of the Urim and Thummim belonged to the *disciplina arcani*, which was, by secret and private tradition, propagated among the Aaronites; and that it would have been unbecoming if the sacred historian had revealed anything of this mystery. But where, throughout the whole Mosaic legislation, do we find an analogy to such mysterious concealment? It is the distinguishing mark of Mosaism, that the whole people, down to the lowest individual, shared the same knowledge, and was admitted to the same sources of information; that the priests had no exclusive privilege whatever; that they were merely the representatives of the first-born sons, in whose stead they were substituted (see note on xiii. 2); that Mosaism created no hierarchy, but a genuine theocracy; that, in fact, the Mosaic legislation constitutes a religious democracy on the basis of perfect equality, and that, therefore, a separate knowledge of one class was utterly excluded (see note on xix. 6). But what would have more seriously endangered this constitution, than if the people were placed in a blind dependance upon ecclesiastical arbitrariness in its most momentous situations? For

5. The end of the Urim and Thummim was, that the High-priest should, by their means, in critical and difficult questions which concerned the whole nation, explore and reveal the will of God; and the history of Israel offers several instances of this practice (Numb. xxvii. 21; 1 Sam. xxviii. 6; compare Ezra ii. 63; Nehem. vii. 65). From this circumstance the Choshen was denominated חשן משפט: "the breast-plate of decision;" and with this name it is introduced in the very beginning of its description (in ver. 15). And this is another indirect reason for the identity of the twelve stones with the Urim and Thummim. Aaron was to wear the decision of the children of Israel on his heart (ver. 30); if the stones were dif-

הָאוּרִים וְאֶת־הַתֻּמִּים וְהָיוּ עַל־לֵב אַהֲרֹן בְּבֹאוֹ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה
וְנָשָׂא אַהֲרֹן אֶת־מִשְׁפַּט בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל־לִבּוֹ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה

ferent from this "decision" they could not have been omitted in this verse; and yet, on the other hand, twelve of the most precious jewels, individually selected after a certain plan, with the names of the tribes engraved on them, are too significant to be a mere unmeaning accessory. Again, for what purpose could those stones be intended? The text answers: "as a memorial before the Lord for ever" (ver. 29). But is not the purpose of the names on the two onyxes of the ephod perfectly the same (ver. 12)? And where is there, in the whole circle of the sacred utensils and robes, any other instance of such strange superfluity? It is therefore evident, that the stones were not merely gems with the names of the children of Israel; they signified more; they were the Urim and Thummin.

6. If these were hidden in the breastplate, unseen by all Israelites, was it not to be apprehended that the people might connect with them superstitious notions? What were those mysterious objects which had the power of manifesting the fates of Israel? And this danger must appear the greater, if we consider that the Urim and Thummim have questionable analogies among idolatrous nations. For, according to several ancient historians (*Diodorus Siculus*, i. 48, 75; *Aelian*, xiv. 34), the chief judge of the Egyptians wore, during his official duties, a golden chain round his neck, to which a golden figure, representing the goddess of Truth (Thruei, Tme, θέμις), was suspended, studded with precious stones of various colours; the Septuagint renders, indeed, Thummim, with ἀλήθεια, whilst, according to Lord Prudhoe, the word Urim is derived from *urei*, the two asps or basilisks which were the emblems of royalty in Egypt; and *ouro* signifies king (compare *Wilkinson*, Manners, ii. p. 26). It can, therefore, scarcely be doubted, that the Urim and Thummim of Moses have some historical relation with that Egyptian custom; now, if they were mysteriously concealed from the people, what would have been more natural than that they represented to themselves in their imagination, similar figures to those which they had seen in Egypt, and that thus their notions, spontaneously bent to polytheistic aberrations, converted the holiest symbols into the absurdest superstition? But,

7. On the other hand, that Egyptian analogy derogates in no manner from the sanctity of the Urim and Thummim; there are several very decided differences. *a.* The Urim and Thummim were not consulted in the usual cases of jurisdiction; they were only resorted to in extraordinary emergencies which had immediate reference to the destinies of the Hebrew theocracy, and, therefore, they consisted of twelve stones, according to the number of the tribes. *b.* They were not regarded as possessing in themselves any divine power; they were mere emblems; they were worn only לזכרון "as a memorial"; it is not from them that the inspiration issues, but from Him who has chosen the children of Jacob as His peculiar nation. And if we consider the end of the Urim and Thummim, it will be obvious, that לזכרון means here, that Aaron shall remember that the interests of the whole of Israel are entrusted to his holiness and his enlightenment; not, as in ver. 12, where לבני ישראל is added, and where the names on the ephod are described as a memorial for the Israelites, that the High-priest prepares himself to expiate their sins, but that this is impossible without their personal cooperation by atonement and contrition. We are long accustomed to the practice of Moses to retain ancient usages, but to ennoble them by entirely divesting them of the impurities of the soil from which they are grown. The phylacteries also were derived from primeval customs, but their external form was filled with a new regenerating spirit.

8. But what is this new meaning, this

URIM AND THE THUMMIM; and they shall be upon Aaron's heart when he goeth in before the Lord; and Aaron shall bear the decision of the children of Israel upon his heart

internal spirit of the Urim and Thummim? This cannot be doubtful after the preceding remarks. As they are identical with the twelve gems, they must have some reference to their symbolical meaning; and this is, as we have observed, the purification and sanctification from the state of sin and worldliness. The brilliancy of the precious stone is a type of the shining splendour of the purified soul, and of the celestial orbs. Now the אורים ותמים are nothing else than this "perfect light or brilliancy"; they represent the absolute banishment of terrestrial selfishness, the highest possible degree of self-denial. Therefore, Aaron had to wear them on the heart (vers. 29, 30), the source of all desires, of all mundane propensities; on the heart, which is "deceitful above everything and malignant, which no man knows, and which God alone searches" (Jer. xvii. 9, 10). If the heart of the High-priest was purified, if he pursued no other interests than the welfare of his people, then only was he worthy and capable of becoming the medium through which Israel received advice and guidance in times of trouble and uncertainty. And hence the much-disputed question, in what manner the answers of the Urim and Thummim were given, is easily to be decided. The High-priest was, by the sight of the gems, powerfully impressed with the grandeur of his mission; his mind gave itself up entirely to the duties of his office; all earthly thoughts vanished before him; he was raised to a prophetic vision, and in this state of enthusiastic sanctity God deigned to reveal to him His will and the fates of His people; and both the High-priest and the people were convinced of the truth of such inspirations. But there is this difference between the High-priest and the prophet, that the former has to try to rise up to God by moral exertion, whilst God descends to the latter spontaneously; the one is a servant, the other a messenger; and therefore the office of the High-priest is continuous, prophets are only inspired in extraordinary times and for special purposes.

We shall now briefly adduce the principal other explanations of the Urim and Thummim. The Septuagint renders, δήλωσις καὶ ἀλήθεια, and so the Vulgate, doctrina et veritas; Luther: Licht und Recht. Josephus writes: "God declared beforehand, by those twelve stones which the High-priest bore on his breast, and which were inserted into his breast-plate, when they should be victorious in battle; for so great a splendour shone forth from them before the army began to march, that all the people were sensible of God's being present for their assistance. Whence it came to pass, that those Greeks who had a veneration for our laws, because they could not possibly contradict this, called that breast-plate the *oracle*" (τὸ λογεῖον; Antiq. III. viii. 9; compare VIII. iii. 8). It is evident from these words, that Josephus considers the Urim and Thummim identical with the twelve stones, which suggested, by miraculous interference, the reply to the High-priest. The latter idea has been still further developed by the Rabbins, who assert, that, by means of the Urim, those letters which belonged to the answer shone in peculiar fulgency, either simultaneously or successively, whilst the Thummim taught the High-priest in which order they were to be read and composed into words (see *Talm.*, Jom. 73: אורים שמאירין את דבריהן תומים שמשלימין את דבריהן); and since the names of the twelve tribes do not contain all the letters of the alphabet, it is asserted, with no degree of probability, that those of the patriarchs were added. But they maintain, that this extraordinary effect was produced on the stone by the Tetragrammaton (שם המפורש), or two holy names of God, which were placed in the cavity of the breast-plate, and which filled the mind of the High-priest

תָּמִיד׃ ס שלישי 31 וְעָשִׂיתָ אֶת־מְעִיל
הָאֵפוֹד כְּלִיל תְּכֵלֶת׃ 32 וְהָיָה פִי־רֹאשׁוֹ בְּתוֹכוֹ שָׂפָה יִהְיֶה
לְפִיו סָבִיב מַעֲשֵׂה אֹרֵג כְּפִי תַחְרָא יִהְיֶה־לּוֹ לֹא יִקָּרֵעַ׃
33 וְעָשִׂיתָ עַל־שׁוּלָיו רִמֹּנֵי תְּכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן וְתוֹלַעַת שְׁנִי עַל־שׁוּלָיו

with enraptured enthusiasm. However, against this acceptation, it has been justly observed, that it attributes to the Tetragrammaton a magic power, than which nothing is more foreign to the spirit of Mosaism. Philo also (Mon. ii. 226) identifies the two sides of the breast-plate with the Urim and Thummim, although his expressions are, in another passage, less distinct (Vit. Mos. ii. 152). It is unquestionable, that Urim and Thummim must be taken as one notion: "the perfectly shining gems," so that both words form a Hendiadys, and that Urim expresses the principal idea; and, in fact, this word is several times used alone, without the addition of Thummim; which is an unmistakeable proof that it is alone sufficient to describe the object (Num. xxvii. 21; 1 Sam. xxv. 6). The circumstance that, in Deut. xxxiii. 8 ("Let Thy Thummim and Thy Urim be with Thy holy one"), the order of both words is inverted, militates so little against this explanation, as Hengstenberg (Mos. and Eg. p. 156) believes, that it offers a new proof and confirmation; "the perfectly shining" are, in fact, identical with the "shining pious"; the latter expression shows that the former has a symbolical meaning; that the gems typify moral purity, spirituality, and aspiration after divine truth; the one is the image, the other is the idea which that image embodies and represents; and thus are "the Thummim and the Urim" a portion of the "holy ones."—Spencer (Legg. Ritual. III. iii. 2) asserts, that the Urim are a kind of figure or Teraphim, put into the Choshen, and that God or His angel revealed through it to the High-priest His will and the future events; whilst the Thummim were a mere symbol of the truthfulness of that revelation. It is scarcely necessary to observe, that this strange opinion is explicable from Spencer's bias to trace the Mosaic institutions to pagan prototypes, and, in this instance, to the accounts of Diodorus and Aelian concerning the figure of Truth which the Egyptian arch-judge wore, during his judicial functions, round his neck. It belongs to those remarkable idiosyncrasies, not uncommon even in great thinkers, that Hengstenberg, the unflinching champion of the Mosaic institutions, perfectly coincides with Spencer, as regards the borrowing of the Hebrew Urim and Thummim from those Egyptian models; and that he thinks to settle the question by the paradoxical remark: "The external resemblance shows the internal difference only in a more striking manner."—Michaelis (Mos. R. i. 52), whom Jahn, Gesenius, and others, follow, believes that the Urim and Thummim were three very ancient stones, one for an affirmative, the other for a negative, and the third for a neutral reply; that they had long been used for lots, and that Moses ordered them to be preserved in the breast-plate. If this opinion is perfectly arbitrary, and sufficiently refuted by passages, as 1 Sam. xxiii. 9, and 2 Sam. ii. 1, it is moderate, if compared with that of Züllig, who maintains, that the Urim and Thummim are diamond dice, partly with the name of God engraved on them; that the Urim are polished, the Thummim unpolished gems; that the High-priest, when he wished to consult God, went into the Tabernacle, cast those dice on a table, observed their relative position, and pronounced the will of God according to a theory traditionally handed down from one High-priest to his successor. It is incredible to add, that a critic like Winer, who is generally distinguished by his sound, plain, com-

before the Lord continually.—31. And thou shalt make
the ROBE OF THE EPHOD all *of* blue. 32. And [1]its opening
for the head shall be in the midst thereof; it shall have
[2]a border of woven work round about its opening, like the
opening of an armour, that it be not rent. 33. And thou
shalt make upon the hem of the robe pomegranates *of*

[1] *Engl. Vers*—There shall be an hole in the top of it, in the midst thereof.
[2] A braiding.

mon-sense views, calls this opinion ingenious, and ranks it among the most plausible explanations of the Urim and Thummim. But if such fantastic and visionary oddities, unsupported by the remotest allusion of the text, are suffered in Biblical criticism, we see no end of conjectures and whimsical combinations, and the study of the sacred records, ceasing to be a science, would only be another name for the production of the wildest and most uncouth subtleties. This remark applies, in some degree, likewise to the exposition of the pontifical attire, which Philippson has developed into minute detail, but which, either viewed as a whole, or in its particular applications, is extremely strange and artificial. He takes the words קדש ליי, which were written on the plate of the mitre, as: "Sanctuary to the Lord," so that the High-priest is himself a Tabernacle, in such manner that the hangings of the Court are the tunic, its vail is the girdle of the tunic; the Holy is represented by the robe, the Holy of Holies by the breast-plate; and so on, in all further specialities, which we trust the reader will allow us to omit. It is obvious, that the High-priest is thus no longer a person, but a thing; how can a thing mediate between God and Israel? where does the Bible offer any basis for such symbolization? if the breast-plate was the Holy of Holies, why was it visible to the whole people, and why was it just the most conspicuous part of the pontifical dress? But we do not intend to criticise an opinion which cannot be considered a desirable addition to the means of understanding the sacred Scriptures, and which seems, like so many others, only to have been framed from the vain desire of proposing a startling novelty. It requires, certainly, by far greater manly firmness to repress a momentary fancy, than to permit the imagination to run riot, ungoverned and unbridled; independence of enquiry is one thing, and extravagance another; and just as much as truth is superior to fallacy, and sterling worth to specious glitter, so much more valuable is quiet and unimpassioned research than high-flown declamation, however brilliant and dazzling it might at first glance appear.

31—35. VII. THE ROBE (מעיל, ποδήρης), which was to be of the weaver's work (מעשה ארג), is likewise called the "robe of the ephod" (ver. 32); for it was worn immediately under it, and above the tunic; but it was longer than the former and shorter than the latter; so that no part of the sacred dress was entirely covered, with the only exception of the drawers, from reasons which will be obvious from our remarks on p. 527. The long girdle of the tunic was also partly visible under the robe. The latter had no sleeves, but was like the tunic entirely woven without the use of the needle; and was furnished at the upper side with an aperture for the head; but in order to prevent tearing the garment, which would have made it unavailable for the sacred service, the rim of the aperture was strengthened with a border (שפה) like the hole of a linen armour (כפי תחרא), which served, therefore, not directly for an ornament. The robe was to be entirely of blue (כליל תכלת). That this is significant cannot be doubted, if we consider, that in Num. xv. 38, the Israelites are commanded to wear on the borders of their garments fringes with a

סָבִ֔יב וּפַעֲמֹנֵ֥י זָהָ֛ב בְּתוֹכָ֖ם סָבִֽיב׃ 34 פַּעֲמֹ֤ן זָהָב֙ וְרִמּ֔וֹן פַּעֲמֹ֥ן
זָהָ֖ב וְרִמּ֑וֹן עַל־שׁוּלֵ֥י הַמְּעִ֖יל סָבִֽיב׃ 35 וְהָיָ֥ה עַל־אַהֲרֹ֖ן לְשָׁרֵ֑ת
וְנִשְׁמַ֣ע ק֠וֹלוֹ בְּבֹא֨וֹ אֶל־הַקֹּ֜דֶשׁ לִפְנֵ֧י יְהוָ֛ה וּבְצֵאת֖וֹ וְלֹ֥א

thread of blue, "that they might see it and remember all the precepts of the Lord"; we may, therefore, safely infer that the robe, with its only blue colour, represented the High-priest as perfectly and entirely under the command of God, as the instrument and guardian of His laws. If the tunic places him in the rank of priests, the robe is the peculiar pontifical garment; the former symbolizes, by its plain whiteness, only purity, absence of worldliness, or mere negative qualities; the latter points, by its blue colour, to heavenly virtue, to an active and positive striving after divine excellence. And yet both have not only that in common that they are both woven, and form one entire piece, but also that they consist of *one* colour, with that difference, that the tunic expresses externally by its squares that perfection which the robe shows by its very colour; and so is the latter again superior to the former. But that this garment might not be wanting in those other colours which are the specific marks of the holy service, it is ordered that on the hem "pomegranates (רמון) of blue and red and crimson," should be affixed. It is obvious, that these pomegranates correspond with the borders and the blue thread commanded for the garments of the rest of the Israelites; but here is that remarkable difference, that whilst the colour of the garments of the Israelites is left optional, that of the pontifical robe reminded, by its blue stuff, of the divine Law; and whilst only the border of the former had such threads, that of the latter consisted entirely of those bright colours hallowed by their constant application for the Tabernacle. If the robe, therefore, is indeed the chief garment of the High Priest—which it certainly is, since the ephod is only a "shoulder-vestment" (*ἐπωμίς*), and the Choshen, a "breast-plate"—nothing describes more distinctly and strikingly his office and his duties. The form of the pomegranates (malum punicum or malum granatum) is not described in the text; it is therefore impossible to decide on this point; the ancient versions express them as the blossoms rather than the fruits (Sept. *ἐξανθούσης ῥόας ῥοΐσκους*, etc.), and in this they have at least several Biblical analogies in their favour. Their meaning is equally uncertain; it is known, that they were to the heathen nations a symbol of procreation and conception; but we need not add, that this notion is perfectly excluded in the Bible; whether they signify the love of God, or the word of God, or the Law, or good works, we must leave undecided. However, it is well-known how much the fruit of the pomegranate-tree (punica arbor, *ῥοά, σίδη*) was valued by the ancient nations. It is found in Palestine, Syria, Arabia, Egypt, India, and the southern countries of Europe. It reaches a height of about 8 or 10 feet; has a straight stem, with many boughs; a reddish rind, and lanceolate, pedunculated leaves; its foliage is bright and dark green; its large flowers, although inodorous, are remarkable for the beautiful crimson colour of the calyx and petals; and its fruit, which is reddish-coloured, of the size and shape of an orange, and ripens in August, is filled with numerous seeds, each surrounded with juicy and delicious pulp, which is eaten in various modes of preparation, and out of which an excellent sherbet is pressed. The tree was naturally much cultivated in gardens and orchards, but grows likewise wild. The Greeks applied several parts for medicinal purposes (as the bark of the root, the flowers, and the rind of the pericarp); and already Homer mentions the pomegranate, which by a rare combination of beauty and usefulness strongly

blue, and red, and crimson, upon its hem round about, and bells of gold between them round about: 34. A golden bell and a pomegranate, a golden bell and a pomegranate, upon the hem of the robe round about. 35. And it shall be upon Aaron to minister; and its sound shall be heard when he goeth into the holy *place* before the Lord, and

recommended itself for artificial and ornamental imitation.—But between every two of these pomegranates (not *into* them) a golden bell (פַּעֲמֹן) was to be inserted round the skirt (according to the Rabbins 72 in all; according to others 12, or 365), "and it shall be upon Aaron to minister; and its sound shall be heard when he goeth into the holy *place* before the Lord, and when he cometh out, that he die not" (ver. 35). These words are too clear to be mistaken; the golden bells were to indicate to the people in the Court when the High-priest entered into the Sanctuary to perform, in their name, the prescribed service, and when he returned after having finished it. We have observed, that the pious devotion of the people was indispensable for rendering the intervention of the High-priest before God efficacious; the whole people was expected to give themselves up to prayer, contrition, and repentance, whilst the High-priest stepped into the immediate nearness of God to officiate in their name; as the High-priest was one, and represented both by his person and his vestments the unity of Israel, so the people was, during his sacred functions, likewise to form a unity; they atoned both for themselves individually, and for the nation, as inseparable members of the people of God—which notions have become familiar to us by the explanation of the paschal-lamb (see chap. xii.)—it was therefore most appropriate that they should all know the moment when he entered the holy abode, that they might collect and concentrate their thoughts upon the sublime task then devolving upon them, and that they should again be informed when he returned, that they might all conclude their religious reflections at the same time, and might thus appear as one undivided community. And nothing was more pertinent than that the High-priest himself made this double announcement by little bells, which probably were just above his knee, so that every step produced a sound calculated to rouse the attention of the people. We believe that we have done nothing more than unfolded what our text contains; several very ancient statements are in harmony with it (Sirach xlv. 11; Luke i. 10; Acts x. 4; Rev. viii. 3, 4); and we reject, therefore, the various conjectures proposed to explain the purport and end of the bells; that they typify the proclamation and expounding of the Law through Aaron, or the vigilance and attention in the execution of the Divine precepts; that they are made in imitation of the bells sometimes worn by Oriental monarchs, or similar vague suppositions.—The words, *that he die not*, do not strictly apply to the transgression of the last-named command, but to the whole cycle of precepts concerning the priestly garments; a similar use of the same phrase occurs in ver. 43; Lev. xvi. 13, etc. The description of Josephus is as follows: "The High-priest is adorned with the same garments which we have described, without omitting one; but over this he puts a vestment of a blue colour. This is a long robe, reaching to his feet, and is tied round with a girdle, embroidered with the same colours and flowers as the former, with a mixture of gold interwoven. To the bottom of this garment are sewed fringes, in colour like pomegranates, with golden bells, by a curious and beautiful contrivance; so that between two bells hangs a pome-

יָמֽוּת׃ ס 36 וְעָשִׂיתָ צִּיץ זָהָב
טָהוֹר וּפִתַּחְתָּ עָלָיו פִּתּוּחֵי חֹתָם קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה׃ 37 וְשַׂמְתָּ אֹתוֹ
עַל־פְּתִיל תְּכֵלֶת וְהָיָה עַל־הַמִּצְנָפֶת אֶל־מוּל פְּנֵי־הַמִּצְנֶפֶת יִהְיֶה׃
38 וְהָיָה עַל־מֵצַח אַהֲרֹן וְנָשָׂא אַהֲרֹן אֶת־עֲוֺן הַקֳּדָשִׁים אֲשֶׁר
יַקְדִּישׁוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְכָל־מַתְּנֹת קָדְשֵׁיהֶם וְהָיָה עַל־מִצְחוֹ תָּמִיד
לְרָצוֹן לָהֶם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה׃ 39 וְשִׁבַּצְתָּ הַכְּתֹנֶת שֵׁשׁ וְעָשִׂיתָ מִצְנֶפֶת
שֵׁשׁ וְאַבְנֵט תַּעֲשֶׂה מַעֲשֵׂה רֹקֵם׃ 40 וְלִבְנֵי אַהֲרֹן תַּעֲשֶׂה כֻתֳּנֹת
וְעָשִׂיתָ לָהֶם אַבְנֵטִים וּמִגְבָּעוֹת תַּעֲשֶׂה לָהֶם לְכָבוֹד וּלְתִפְאָרֶת׃
41 וְהִלְבַּשְׁתָּ אֹתָם אֶת־אַהֲרֹן אָחִיךָ וְאֶת־בָּנָיו אִתּוֹ וּמָשַׁחְתָּ אֹתָם
וּמִלֵּאתָ אֶת־יָדָם וְקִדַּשְׁתָּ אֹתָם וְכִהֲנוּ־לִי׃ 42 וַעֲשֵׂה לָהֶם מִכְנְסֵי־
בָד לְכַסּוֹת בְּשַׂר עֶרְוָה מִמָּתְנַיִם וְעַד־יְרֵכַיִם יִהְיוּ׃ 43 וְהָיוּ עַל־

granate, and between two pomegranates a bell. Now this vesture was not composed of two pieces, nor was it sewed together upon the shoulders and the sides, but it was one long vestment, so woven as to have an aperture for the neck; not an oblique one, but parted all along the breast and the back. A border also was sewed to it, lest the aperture should look too indecent; it was also parted where the hands were to come out." Although these statements are in general correct, especially the last words, which seem to imply that the robe had no sleeves, they contain the following inaccuracies: 1. Our text does not mention that a girdle belonged to the robe; it was, in fact, unnecessary, as the girdle of the ephod, which was above the robe, kept it sufficiently close to the body. 2. The fringes resembled the pomegranates in shape, not in colour; for whilst the former consisted of the colours of the Tabernacle, the latter are only red. 3. The fringes were not sewed to the robe, but woven on it. 4. The aperture was only intended for the neck, and was therefore not parted on the breast and the back; and 5. The border of the aperture was not for ornament, but for use.

36—38. VIII. The Mitre and the Plate have already been described in p. 528; and we observe here only with regard to ver. 38, that one of the functions of the High-priest was to purify from their sins those who made any offering in the holy Tabernacle; for as long as they are infected with iniquity, God does not accept their gifts; He does not delight in sacrifices and oblations, but in a pure heart; if the former are not the symbol of the latter, they are an abomination to Him; the reconciliation of man with God ensues by internal reform and purification; as long as the latter has not taken place, his offerings and sacrifices are likewise considered unclean (not as the Rabbins believe, because the objects are in themselves unclean, as the productions of nature); but the High-priest wears on his mitre the golden plate with the majestic words: "Holiness to the Lord"; by means of this highest ornament he "bears the iniquity of the holy things, which the children of Israel hallow in all their holy gifts"; the Israelite in beholding and reflecting on the deep meaning of those words, becomes impressed with his sinfulness, thereby frees himself from it internally; thus his

when he cometh out, that he die not.—36. And thou shalt make a PLATE *of* pure gold, and thou shalt engrave upon it, *like* the engravings of a signet: HOLINESS TO THE LORD. 37. And thou shalt put it on a ribbon of blue, that it may be upon the mitre; upon the forefront of the mitre it shall be. 38. And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead, that Aaron may bear the iniquity of the sacred things which the children of Israel will consecrate, with all their sacred gifts; and it shall be always upon his forehead, that they may be acceptable before the Lord.—39. And thou shalt [1]weave the TUNIC of fine linen; and thou shalt make a MITRE of fine linen; and a GIRDLE shalt thou make of the work of the embroiderer.—40. And for Aaron's sons shalt thou make TUNICS, and thou shalt make for them GIRDLES, and TURBANS shalt thou make for them, for glory and for distinction. 41. And thou shalt clothe with them Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him; and thou shalt anoint them, and consecrate them, and sanctify them, that they may serve me as priests. 42. And thou shalt make them linen DRAWERS, to cover the flesh of their nakedness; from the loins to the thighs they shall reach: 43. And they shall be upon Aaron, and upon his sons,

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Embroider.

gifts become likewise pure and acceptable before the Lord. And because the plate of the mitre was intended to work such great and momentous effects, the High-priest was commanded perpetually to wear it on his forehead, that the means of grace and purification might ever be ready to the whole people. We believe that these are the highest possible religious conceptions; and it is obvious how far from the truth those are who see in our verse "narrow-minded and imperfect notions" of an uncivilized people, which endeavoured to obtain the favour of their God by presents, just as Oriental monarchs are propitiated by their subjects. The offerings are not brought for the sake of God, but for the sake of him who presents them; and as they must be preceded by internal regeneration, they are an open confession, that the moral harmony of the mind is restored, that the heart's equipoise is regained.

40. About the garments of the common priests, see note on ver. 4.

41. The ceremonies connected with the inauguration of the priests are described and explained in the next chapter.

We have only to add, with regard to the sacred garments, that they seem to have been preserved in the holy treasury (Ezra ii. 69; Neh. vii. 70); or if we may draw an inference from a prophetic vision and consider it based on historic fact, they were, after the conclusion of the ministrations, laid up in the holy chambers (Ezek. xliii. 14; xliv. 17—19); that even

אַהֲרֹן וְעַל־בָּנָיו בְּבֹאָם ׀ אֶל־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד אוֹ בְגִשְׁתָּם אֶל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ
לְשָׁרֵת בַּקֹּדֶשׁ וְלֹא־יִשְׂאוּ עָוֺן וָמֵתוּ חֻקַּת עוֹלָם לוֹ וּלְזַרְעוֹ
אַחֲרָיו׃ ס רביעי

after they had become unavailable for the priests, they were appropriated for the service of the Sanctuary, as, for instance, for the wicks of the lamps burnt

כט 1 וְזֶה הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשֶׂה לָהֶם לְקַדֵּשׁ אֹתָם לְכַהֵן לִי לְקַח
פַּר אֶחָד בֶּן־בָּקָר וְאֵילִם שְׁנַיִם תְּמִימִם׃ 2 וְלֶחֶם מַצּוֹת וְחַלֹּת
מַצֹּת בְּלוּלֹת בַּשֶּׁמֶן וּרְקִיקֵי מַצּוֹת מְשֻׁחִים בַּשָּׁמֶן סֹלֶת חִטִּים
תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתָם׃ 3 וְנָתַתָּ אוֹתָם עַל־סַל אֶחָד וְהִקְרַבְתָּ אֹתָם בַּסָּל
וְאֶת־הַפָּר וְאֵת שְׁנֵי הָאֵילִם׃ 4 וְאֶת־אַהֲרֹן וְאֶת־בָּנָיו תַּקְרִיב אֶל־

CHAPTER XXIX.

SUMMARY.—The ceremonies to be performed at the consecration of Aaron and his sons are prescribed; they consist in washing, clothing, and anointing them with oil; a bullock is killed as a sin-offering, a ram as a burnt-offering, and another ram as a consecration-offering; a loaf, a cake, and a wafer, are prescribed as a wave-offering; the breast of the consecration-offering is waved, its leg heaved, and both parts are sanctified to belong, in all future times, to the priests (vers. 27, 28), whilst, in this instance, they were the portion of Moses, who acted as priest in the consecration-ceremonies (ver. 26). Aaron's successor shall be consecrated in his father's holy garments (vers. 29, 30). The flesh of the ram of consecration is to be eaten in the holy place by Aaron and his sons; and no stranger is to be admitted to it; if anything remains, it is to be burnt (vers. 33, 34). The ceremonies of consecration are to be repeated during seven days (ver. 35). Then the sacrifices for the expiation of the altar (vers. 36, 37), and the daily sacrifices are prescribed (vers. 38—42); the latter were, one lamb in the morning, and one at dusk, each time accompanied by an oblation of flour, and a libation of wine. God promises to dwell among Israel, to meet them in the holy Tabernacle, and to shield them, as their God, always with the same power and love with which He has redeemed them from Egypt.

1. The construction of the Tabernacle has been ordered; Aaron and his sons have been appointed for its service; their official significant garments have been described, and every preparation is therefore made to enable them to enter upon their sacred functions. But the commencement of their activity was too important an event to be left without some imposing solemnity; it makes a decided epoch in the history of Israel; it is, in fact, the corner-stone of Israel's entire existence. For they were destined to be "a kingdom of priests;" the end of their national life was not worldly splendour, nor conquest and extension of territory; not military glory and accumulation of wealth; but sanctification, spirituality, and purity; in this point they were to be distinguished from all the other nations; their energies were to be directed to heaven, not to earth; to the purification and ennoblement of the heart, which is the only imperishable and truly beatifying boon, and not to the possessions of the earth, which are vanity and vexation of spirit. Religion is the kernel of Mosaism, and the first institutions, therefore, which it created were intended to secure for it a solid foundation, and before any other arrangement was made, either civil or political, the service of the Tabernacle was regulated in all its

when they come into the Tabernacle of Meeting, or when they approach the altar to minister in the holy *place;* that they bear not iniquity, and die: *it shall be* a statute for ever to him and his seed after him.

on the Feast of Tabernacles; and that the High-priest was consecrated in the official robes of his predecessor, which he wore during the seven days of his initiation (xxix. 29, 30).

CHAP. XXIX. 1. And this *is* the thing which thou shalt do to them to hallow them to serve me as priests: Take one young bullock, and two rams without blemish, 2. And unleavened bread, and unleavened cakes [1]poured over with oil, and unleavened wafers anointed with oil: *of* fine flour of wheat shalt thou make them. 3. And thou shalt put them into one basket, and offer them in the basket, with the bullock and the two rams. 4. And Aaron and his sons thou shalt let approach to the door of the Tabernacle of [2]Meeting, and thou shalt wash them

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Tempered. [2] The congregation.

detail. Nor is the wisdom of the legislator herein less obvious than in all his other laws. The fear of God is the first condition of all human virtues; hence the decalogue contains in its first five commandments, our duties towards God, and, in the latter five, those towards our fellow-men; the altar and the offerings were destined to restore the harmony between God and man, which had been disturbed by sin and transgression; they were the means by which the cravings of the weak heart were satisfied, by which man might approach the purity of his Divine prototype, and by which he might, at least temporarily, divest himself of selfishness and pride; thus, a reconciliation, not with God only, but also with man, was produced, and piety became the parent of all personal and social virtues. But it is obvious that the full import and significance of the ceremonies of consecration can only be understood in connection with the sacrifices in general; for they mirror forth the priestly duties in their relation to the various kinds of sacrifices. We must, therefore, reserve a complete exposition of these rites to the eighth chapter of Leviticus, where the actual inauguration of Aaron and his sons is related. In this place we content ourselves with such remarks as are indispensable for the immediate understanding of the text.

2. The *bread* (לחם) is thick and hard, first sodden, and then baked in oil; the *cakes* (חלות) are only baked, thick, and mingled with oil, perhaps perforated (from חלל); and the *wafers* are, like the cakes, baked, but thin, and afterwards poured over with oil. To eat such oiled cakes is still customary in many parts of the East. On the olive oil in general, see p. 482.

3. Moses consecrates Aaron and his sons; he performs, therefore, on this one occasion, the duties of a priest, and receives, accordingly, the usual emoluments appropriated for the latter (ver. 26).

4. The first ceremony was, that Aaron and his sons were washed; whether their hands and feet only, as was customary

פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וְרָחַצְתָּ אֹתָם בַּמָּיִם׃ 5 וְלָקַחְתָּ אֶת־הַבְּגָדִים
וְהִלְבַּשְׁתָּ אֶת־אַהֲרֹן אֶת־הַכֻּתֹּנֶת וְאֵת מְעִיל הָאֵפֹד וְאֶת־הָאֵפֹד
וְאֶת־הַחֹשֶׁן וְאָפַדְתָּ לוֹ בְּחֵשֶׁב הָאֵפֹד׃ 6 וְשַׂמְתָּ הַמִּצְנֶפֶת עַל־
רֹאשׁוֹ וְנָתַתָּ אֶת־נֵזֶר הַקֹּדֶשׁ עַל־הַמִּצְנָפֶת׃ 7 וְלָקַחְתָּ אֶת־שֶׁמֶן
הַמִּשְׁחָה וְיָצַקְתָּ עַל־רֹאשׁוֹ וּמָשַׁחְתָּ אֹתוֹ׃ 8 וְאֶת־בָּנָיו תַּקְרִיב
וְהִלְבַּשְׁתָּם כֻּתֳּנֹת׃ 9 וְחָגַרְתָּ אֹתָם אַבְנֵט אַהֲרֹן וּבָנָיו וְחָבַשְׁתָּ
לָהֶם מִגְבָּעֹת וְהָיְתָה לָהֶם כְּהֻנָּה לְחֻקַּת עוֹלָם וּמִלֵּאתָ יַד־אַהֲרֹן
וְיַד־בָּנָיו׃ 10 וְהִקְרַבְתָּ אֶת־הַפָּר לִפְנֵי אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וְסָמַךְ אַהֲרֹן
וּבָנָיו אֶת־יְדֵיהֶם עַל־רֹאשׁ הַפָּר׃ 11 וְשָׁחַטְתָּ אֶת־הַפָּר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה
פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד׃ 12 וְלָקַחְתָּ מִדַּם הַפָּר וְנָתַתָּה עַל־קַרְנֹת הַמִּזְבֵּחַ
בְּאֶצְבָּעֶךָ וְאֶת־כָּל־הַדָּם תִּשְׁפֹּךְ אֶל־יְסוֹד הַמִּזְבֵּחַ׃ 13 וְלָקַחְתָּ

before every ministration, or whether other parts of the body likewise, as Jewish commentators believe, is uncertain. The washing symbolized the purification from sin, which constitutes the first negative element in the internal requirements of a priest.

7. The *diadem* is the *plate* of the mitre (p. 528); and the addition, "the diadem of holiness," points still more clearly to the words: "Holiness to the Lord" engraved on it. נזר may etymologically signify "distinction," for the verb means to separate, and therefore is נזיר, a Nazarite, or one who is distinguished from the rest of men by adhering to certain unusual observances. That the plate, and those words inscribed on it were, indeed, the characteristic and distinguishing mark of the High-priest, has been observed in p. 528.

8. The unction of the High-priest seems to have been different from that of the common priests, for whilst, with regard to the former, the verb יצק, *to pour*, is used, the word משח, *to anoint*, is employed with reference to the latter; and between both words the Rabbins have established this difference, that the former implies a complete and abundant pouring of oil; whilst the latter is merely a marking with the finger on the forehead. This distinction is not improbable, since the forehead is, as we have shown, that part of the head on which, usually, signs and badges were worn. The symbolical meaning of olive-oil has been a matter of much dispute. We observe here, but briefly, that it is partly, on account of its richness and fatness, an emblem of power and success; and partly, as is well known, a type of peace and reconciliation; in the former sense it is the symbol of royalty, in the latter that of priestdom; for the priest is the harbinger of the peace of the soul, and of reconciliation with God; and if the Tabernacle also, as we shall see, was anointed with oil, it is thereby very appropriately designated as an abode where man might regain the peace and harmony of his mind, and restore a complete union with his Creator. But as the kings possess their power as a gift of God, and stand, therefore, under His sovereignty, and are consecrated to Him; and as internal peace and reconciliation are the conditions of a holy life, such as is required in a priest, the oil is, at the same time, the emblem of sanctity; the kings are sacred to God as His worldly substi-

with water. 5. And thou shalt take the garments, and clothe Aaron with the tunic, and the robe of the ephod, and the ephod, and the breast-plate, and thou shalt gird him with the [1]band of the ephod: 6. And thou shalt put the mitre upon his head, and put the holy diadem upon the mitre. 7. And thou shalt take the anointing oil, and shalt pour *it* upon his head, and anoint him. 8. And thou shalt let his sons approach, and thou shalt clothe them with tunics. 9. And thou shalt gird them with girdles, Aaron and his sons, and bind on them turbans. And the priest's office shall be theirs for an eternal statute, and *thus* thou shalt consecrate Aaron and his sons. 10. And thou shalt bring [2]the bullock before the Tabernacle of Meeting; and Aaron and his sons shall put their hands upon the head of the bullock. 11. And thou shalt kill the bullock before the Lord *at* the door of the Tabernacle of Meeting. 12. And thou shalt take of the blood of the bullock, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar with thy finger, and all the *other* blood beside the bottom of the altar. 13. And thou shalt take all the fat which covereth

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Curious girdle. [2] A bullock.

tutes, the priests, as His spiritual representatives; the holy oil is the public sign of this delegation of power; those, therefore, who insult kings and priests, are considered as traitors against the Divine authority (2 Sam. i. 14).

9. ***And thou shalt consecrate Aaron and his sons.*** The Hebrew words signify literally: "And thou shalt fill the hand of Aaron and the hand of his sons" (ומלאת יד אהרן ויד בניו). This phrase seems to have originated in a certain ancient ceremony connected with the appointment or consecration of officials; perhaps the signs and emblems of their functions were, with solemn rites, given into their hands; and in ver. 24, it is indeed related, that Moses, who acted here in the name of God, placed in the hands of Aaron and his sons, the fat, and certain parts of the ram of consecration, further, one loaf of bread, one cake, and one oiled wafer. These objects must, therefore, be considered as representing the character of the priest's office; they were burnt to the Lord as a sweet odour, as an acceptable offering (ver. 25); they typified expiation and conciliation, and they thus expressed the chief tendency of the sacrifices.

10. This verse is the immediate continuation of ver. 3. The bullock was brought "before the Tabernacle of Meeting," that is, into the Court, where the altar of burnt-offering stood. Aaron and his sons put their hands upon the head of the animal as a symbol, that it takes upon itself their sins, or that, by sacrificing it, their sins might be pardoned them. In vers. 15 and 19, the same ceremony signifies, that the beasts are offered in their name, and are intended to represent certain results affecting them personally.

13. יותרת, originally, that which is superfluous, used of the greater lobe of

אֶת־כָּל־הַחֵלֶב הַמְכַסֶּה אֶת־הַקֶּרֶב וְאֵת הַיֹּתֶרֶת עַל־הַכָּבֵד וְאֵת
שְׁתֵּי הַכְּלָיֹת וְאֶת־הַחֵלֶב אֲשֶׁר עֲלֵיהֶן וְהִקְטַרְתָּ הַמִּזְבֵּחָה׃
14 וְאֶת־בְּשַׂר הַפָּר וְאֶת־עֹרוֹ וְאֶת־פִּרְשׁוֹ תִּשְׂרֹף בָּאֵשׁ מִחוּץ
לַמַּחֲנֶה חַטָּאת הוּא׃ 15 וְאֶת־הָאַיִל הָאֶחָד תִּקָּח וְסָמְכוּ אַהֲרֹן
וּבָנָיו אֶת־יְדֵיהֶם עַל־רֹאשׁ הָאָיִל׃ 16 וְשָׁחַטְתָּ אֶת־הָאָיִל וְלָקַחְתָּ
אֶת־דָּמוֹ וְזָרַקְתָּ עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סָבִיב׃ 17 וְאֶת־הָאַיִל תְּנַתֵּחַ
לִנְתָחָיו וְרָחַצְתָּ קִרְבּוֹ וּכְרָעָיו וְנָתַתָּ עַל־נְתָחָיו וְעַל־רֹאשׁוֹ׃
18 וְהִקְטַרְתָּ אֶת־כָּל־הָאַיִל הַמִּזְבֵּחָה עֹלָה הוּא לַיהוָה רֵיחַ
נִיחוֹחַ אִשֶּׁה לַיהוָה הוּא׃ חמישי 19 וְלָקַחְתָּ
אֵת הָאַיִל הַשֵּׁנִי וְסָמַךְ אַהֲרֹן וּבָנָיו אֶת־יְדֵיהֶם עַל־רֹאשׁ הָאָיִל׃
20 וְשָׁחַטְתָּ אֶת־הָאַיִל וְלָקַחְתָּ מִדָּמוֹ וְנָתַתָּה עַל־תְּנוּךְ אֹזֶן אַהֲרֹן
וְעַל־תְּנוּךְ אֹזֶן בָּנָיו הַיְמָנִית וְעַל־בֹּהֶן יָדָם הַיְמָנִית וְעַל־בֹּהֶן
רַגְלָם הַיְמָנִית וְזָרַקְתָּ אֶת־הַדָּם עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סָבִיב׃ 21 וְלָקַחְתָּ
מִן־הַדָּם אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וּמִשֶּׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה וְהִזֵּיתָ עַל־אַהֲרֹן וְעַל־
בְּגָדָיו וְעַל־בָּנָיו וְעַל־בִּגְדֵי בָנָיו אִתּוֹ וְקָדַשׁ הוּא וּבְגָדָיו וּבָנָיו
וּבִגְדֵי בָנָיו אִתּוֹ׃ 22 וְלָקַחְתָּ מִן־הָאַיִל הַחֵלֶב וְהָאַלְיָה וְאֶת־
הַחֵלֶב׀ הַמְכַסֶּה אֶת־הַקֶּרֶב וְאֵת יֹתֶרֶת הַכָּבֵד וְאֵת׀ שְׁתֵּי הַכְּלָיֹת
וְאֶת־הַחֵלֶב אֲשֶׁר עֲלֵיהֶן וְאֵת שׁוֹק הַיָּמִין כִּי אֵיל מִלֻּאִים הוּא׃

the liver; Septuagint, λοβὸς τοῦ ἥπατος; Vulgate, reticulum hepatis. The liver, says Avicenna, has certain additional parts, by which it encloses the stomach and is connected with it. The largest of these additions is what is called by a special name *siada*. Upon this lies the gall, whence it extends lower down.

17, 18. The ram of the burnt-offering was to be cut "into its pieces" (לנתחיו), that is, probably, into its natural limbs; whilst the bullock was burnt entirely without being divided, because it was a sin-offering. The former was further burnt wholly on the altar; the latter, except some parts specified in ver. 13, without the camp.—אִשֶּׁה (from אשש), is an oblation which was consumed by fire in honour of God; it is, therefore, not only used with reference to animal sacrifices, but also to incense.

20. A part of the blood of the ram of consecration was sprinkled upon the ears of Aaron and his sons, to remind them always to listen to the commands of God; upon their hands, to enjoin the duty of activity and zeal in the service of God; and upon their feet, to symbolize their walking in the ways of the Law.

21. The sons of Aaron were anointed like Aaron himself; the oil was the principal part of the substance which was

the inwards, and [1]the lobe which is above the liver, and the two kidneys, and the fat which *is* upon them, and burn *them* on the altar. 14. But the flesh of the bullock, and its skin, and its dung, thou shalt burn with fire without the camp: it *is* a sin-offering.—15. And thou shalt also take the one ram, and Aaron and his sons shall put their hands upon the head of the ram. 16. And thou shalt kill the ram, and thou shalt take its blood, and sprinkle *it* on the altar round about. 17. And thou shalt cut the ram [2]into its pieces, and wash its inwards, and its legs, and put *them* to its pieces, and to its head. 18. And thou shalt burn the whole ram *upon* the altar: it *is* a burnt-offering to the Lord; it *is* a sweet odour, an offering made by fire to the Lord. 19. And thou shalt take the second ram, and Aaron and his sons shall lay their hands upon the head of the ram. 20. And thou shalt kill the ram, and take of its blood, and put *it* upon the tip of the right ear of Aaron, and upon the tip of the right ear of his sons, and upon the thumb of their right hand, and upon the great toe of their right foot, and sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about. 21. And thou shalt take of the blood which *is* upon the altar, and of the anointing oil, and sprinkle *it* upon Aaron, and upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon the garments of his sons with him; and he shall be hallowed, and his garments, and his sons, and the garments of his sons with him. 22. And thou shalt take of the ram the fat and the [3]fat tail, and the fat which covereth the inwards, and the lobe of the liver, and the two kidneys, and the fat which *is* upon them, and the right [4]leg; for it *is* a ram of con-

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Caul. [2] In pieces. [3] Rump. [4] Shoulder.

sprinkled on them and on their garments; the blood was only added from the rams of the burnt-offering and of consecration, to show still more clearly that they were, by these ceremonies, appointed to God, and that they were holy to Him.

22. *And the fat tail.* It is known that the tail of a certain species of sheep (ovis laticaudata), found in different parts of the East, contains a great quantity, often more than twenty pounds, of the finest fat, and that it is, therefore, put on a little cart tied behind the animal, partly to preserve the tail and the fat, partly to ease the sheep (see *Herod.* iii. 115; *Aristot.*, Hist. Anim. viii. 28; *Aelian.* iii. 3; *Leo Africanus* ix. 38, etc.). It is thus accountable, that the tails of sheep, but not

23 וְכִכַּר לֶחֶם אַחַת וְחַלַּת לֶחֶם שֶׁמֶן אַחַת וְרָקִיק אֶחָד מִסַּל
הַמַּצּוֹת אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי יְהוָֹה׃ 24 וְשַׂמְתָּ הַכֹּל עַל כַּפֵּי אַהֲרֹן וְעַל
כַּפֵּי בָנָיו וְהֵנַפְתָּ אֹתָם תְּנוּפָה לִפְנֵי יְהוָֹה׃ 25 וְלָקַחְתָּ אֹתָם
מִיָּדָם וְהִקְטַרְתָּ הַמִּזְבֵּחָה עַל־הָעֹלָה לְרֵיחַ נִיחוֹחַ לִפְנֵי יְהוָֹה אִשֶּׁה
הוּא לַיהוָֹה׃ 26 וְלָקַחְתָּ אֶת־הֶחָזֶה מֵאֵיל הַמִּלֻּאִים אֲשֶׁר לְאַהֲרֹן
וְהֵנַפְתָּ אֹתוֹ תְּנוּפָה לִפְנֵי יְהוָֹה וְהָיָה לְךָ לְמָנָה׃ 27 וְקִדַּשְׁתָּ
אֵת ׀ חֲזֵה הַתְּנוּפָה וְאֵת שׁוֹק הַתְּרוּמָה אֲשֶׁר הוּנַף וַאֲשֶׁר הוּרָם
מֵאֵיל הַמִּלֻּאִים מֵאֲשֶׁר לְאַהֲרֹן וּמֵאֲשֶׁר לְבָנָיו׃ 28 וְהָיָה לְאַהֲרֹן
וּלְבָנָיו לְחָק־עוֹלָם מֵאֵת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי תְרוּמָה הוּא וּתְרוּמָה
יִהְיֶה מֵאֵת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִזִּבְחֵי שַׁלְמֵיהֶם תְּרוּמָתָם לַיהוָֹה׃
29 וּבִגְדֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר לְאַהֲרֹן יִהְיוּ לְבָנָיו אַחֲרָיו לְמָשְׁחָה בָהֶם
וּלְמַלֵּא־בָם אֶת־יָדָם׃ 30 שִׁבְעַת יָמִים יִלְבָּשָׁם הַכֹּהֵן תַּחְתָּיו מִבָּנָיו
אֲשֶׁר יָבֹא אֶל־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד לְשָׁרֵת בַּקֹּדֶשׁ׃ 31 וְאֵת אֵיל הַמִּלֻּאִים
תִּקָּח וּבִשַּׁלְתָּ אֶת־בְּשָׂרוֹ בְּמָקֹם קָדֹשׁ׃ 32 וְאָכַל אַהֲרֹן וּבָנָיו אֶת־
בְּשַׂר הָאַיִל וְאֶת־הַלֶּחֶם אֲשֶׁר בַּסָּל פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד׃ 33 וְאָכְלוּ
אֹתָם אֲשֶׁר כֻּפַּר בָּהֶם לְמַלֵּא אֶת־יָדָם לְקַדֵּשׁ אֹתָם וְזָר לֹא־יֹאכַל
כִּי־קֹדֶשׁ הֵם׃ 34 וְאִם־יִוָּתֵר מִבְּשַׂר הַמִּלֻּאִים וּמִן־הַלֶּחֶם עַד־
הַבֹּקֶר וְשָׂרַפְתָּ אֶת־הַנּוֹתָר בָּאֵשׁ לֹא יֵאָכֵל כִּי־קֹדֶשׁ הוּא׃
35 וְעָשִׂיתָ לְאַהֲרֹן וּלְבָנָיו כָּכָה כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר־צִוִּיתִי אֹתָכָה שִׁבְעַת

those of bulls, are mentioned in the Mosaic sacrifices.

24. The waving (תנופה) consisted in turning the offering to all the four parts of the earth and to heaven, as a symbol, that it was destined for the Lord of heaven and earth; but the heaving (תרומה) was only a movement of the offering up and down (ver. 28).

27. This and the succeeding verse must be taken as a parenthetical digression: the breast and the leg belonged, in this case, to Moses, who officiated as priest; but it was, in all future peace-offerings, the portion of Aaron and his sons.

31. The flesh of the ram of consecration was to be boiled "in the holy place," that is, in the Court of the Tabernacle, where it was also to be eaten (ver. 32), by priests only (ver. 33), in order to impart to this initiatory sacrifice a still higher sanctity.

34. See xii. 10.

35. The consecration of Aaron and his sons was to last for seven days; by this number, the ceremonies prescribed for it

secration: 23. And one loaf of bread, and one cake of oiled bread, and one wafer out of the basket of the unleavened bread, which *is* before the Lord: 24. And thou shalt put all in the hands of Aaron, and in the hands of his sons; and thou shalt wave them *for* a wave-offering before the Lord. 25. And thou shalt take them from their hands, and burn *them upon* the altar [1]besides the burnt-offering, for a sweet odour before the Lord, it *is* an offering made by fire to the Lord. 26. And thou shalt take the breast of the ram of Aaron's consecration, and thou shalt wave it *for* a wave-offering before the Lord: and it shall be thy part. (27. And thou shalt hallow the breast of the wave-offering, and the [2]leg of the heave-offering, which has been waved and heaved of the ram of the consecration, *namely* of *that* which *is* for Aaron, and of *that* which *is* for his sons: 28. And it shall belong to Aaron and to his sons, by an eternal statute, from the children of Israel; for it *is* a heave-offering: and [3]a heave-offering shall be *brought* from the children of Israel, of their peace-offerings, their heave-offering for the Lord).—29. And the holy garments of Aaron shall be his sons' after him, to be anointed therein, and to be consecrated in them. 30. Seven days shall he of his sons who *will be* priest in his stead put them on, [4]*he* who cometh into the Tabernacle of Meeting to minister in the holy *place*.—31. And thou shalt take the ram of the consecration, and seethe its flesh in the holy place. 32. And Aaron and his sons shall eat the flesh of the ram, and the bread which *is* in the basket, *at* the door of the Tabernacle of Meeting. 33. And they shall eat those things wherewith the atonement was made, to consecrate *and* to hallow them; but a stranger shall not eat *thereof*, for they *are* holy. 34. And if aught of the flesh of the consecration and of the bread remain to the morning, then thou shalt burn the remainder with fire; it shall not be eaten, for it *is* holy. 35. And thus shalt thou do to Aaron, and to his sons, according to

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—For. [2] Shoulder. [3] It shall be a heave-offering from the children of Israel. [4] When he.

יָמִ֖ים תְּמַלֵּ֥א יָדָֽם׃ 36 וּפַר֩ חַטָּ֨את תַּעֲשֶׂ֤ה לַיּוֹם֙ עַל־הַכִּפֻּרִ֔ים
וְחִטֵּאתָ֙ עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּ֔חַ בְּכַפֶּרְךָ֖ עָלָ֑יו וּמָשַׁחְתָּ֥ אֹת֖וֹ לְקַדְּשֽׁוֹ׃
37 שִׁבְעַ֣ת יָמִ֗ים תְּכַפֵּר֙ עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּ֔חַ וְקִדַּשְׁתָּ֖ אֹת֑וֹ וְהָיָ֤ה הַמִּזְבֵּ֙חַ֙
קֹ֣דֶשׁ קָֽדָשִׁ֔ים כָּל־הַנֹּגֵ֥עַ בַּמִּזְבֵּ֖חַ יִקְדָּֽשׁ׃ ס ששי 38 וְזֶ֕ה
אֲשֶׁ֥ר תַּעֲשֶׂ֖ה עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּ֑חַ כְּבָשִׂ֧ים בְּנֵֽי־שָׁנָ֛ה שְׁנַ֥יִם לַיּ֖וֹם תָּמִֽיד׃
39 אֶת־הַכֶּ֥בֶשׂ הָאֶחָ֖ד תַּעֲשֶׂ֣ה בַבֹּ֑קֶר וְאֵת֙ הַכֶּ֣בֶשׂ הַשֵּׁנִ֔י תַּעֲשֶׂ֖ה
בֵּ֥ין הָעַרְבָּֽיִם׃ 40 וְעִשָּׂרֹ֨ן סֹ֜לֶת בָּל֨וּל בְּשֶׁ֤מֶן כָּתִית֙ רֶ֣בַע הַהִ֔ין
וְנֵ֕סֶךְ רְבִיעִ֥ת הַהִ֖ין יָ֑יִן לַכֶּ֖בֶשׂ הָאֶחָֽד׃ 41 וְאֵת֙ הַכֶּ֣בֶשׂ הַשֵּׁנִ֔י
תַּעֲשֶׂ֖ה בֵּ֣ין הָֽעַרְבָּ֑יִם כְּמִנְחַ֨ת הַבֹּ֤קֶר וּכְנִסְכָּהּ֙ תַּעֲשֶׂה־לָּ֔הּ לְרֵ֣יחַ
נִיחֹ֔חַ אִשֶּׁ֖ה לַיהוָֽה׃ 42 עֹלַ֤ת תָּמִיד֙ לְדֹרֹ֣תֵיכֶ֔ם פֶּ֥תַח אֹֽהֶל־מוֹעֵ֖ד
לִפְנֵ֣י יְהוָ֑ה אֲשֶׁ֨ר אִוָּעֵ֤ד לָכֶם֙ שָׁ֔מָּה לְדַבֵּ֥ר אֵלֶ֖יךָ שָֽׁם׃ 43 וְנֹעַדְתִּ֥י
שָׁ֖מָּה לִבְנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵ֑ל וְנִקְדַּ֖שׁ בִּכְבֹדִֽי׃ 44 וְקִדַּשְׁתִּ֛י אֶת־אֹ֥הֶל מוֹעֵ֖ד
וְאֶת־הַמִּזְבֵּ֑חַ וְאֶת־אַהֲרֹ֧ן וְאֶת־בָּנָ֛יו אֲקַדֵּ֖שׁ לְכַהֵ֥ן לִֽי׃ 45 וְשָׁ֣כַנְתִּ֔י
בְּת֖וֹךְ בְּנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵ֑ל וְהָיִ֥יתִי לָהֶ֖ם לֵאלֹהִֽים׃ 46 וְיָדְע֗וּ כִּ֣י אֲנִ֤י יְהוָה֙
אֱלֹ֣הֵיהֶ֔ם אֲשֶׁ֨ר הוֹצֵ֧אתִי אֹתָ֛ם מֵאֶ֥רֶץ מִצְרַ֖יִם לְשָׁכְנִ֣י בְתוֹכָ֑ם אֲנִ֖י
יְהוָ֥ה אֱלֹהֵיהֶֽם׃ פ שביעי

are characterized as holy and divine; and the rites assume a deeper meaning. Our text does not justify us in supposing, that only certain parts of those ceremonies were repeated during these seven days.

36, 37. The altar was, through the animals sacrificed thereon, the direct local medium of conciliation and atonement; it was, therefore, necessary that it should itself be, and appear, clean; it was to be expiated in the same manner as the priests themselves, by sacrifice and anointment. That sacrifice was, naturally, a sin-offering.—*Whosoever toucheth the altar must be holy*; no unclean individual was allowed to approach it; it does not mean: whatever has once touched the altar must be considered holy.

38—42. *The daily sacrifices.* About the *omer* and *hin*, see note on xvi. 16, 36.

43—46. Only when the priests, their garments, and the altar, are duly purified and consecrated, God promises to meet Israel in the Tabernacle, to dwell among them, to sanctify them by His glory, and so to assist and protect them, that they will know that He is the same God, who rescued them from the Egyptian thraldom, and selected them as His people.—About the meaning of אהל מועד, see p. 493. Onkelos and Jonathan translate the words אשר אועד להם וכו׳, etc., in ver. 42: די אזמן מימרי לכון תמן, "where I shall address to you my word;" the Septuagint: ἐν οἷς γνωσθήσομαί σοι ἐκεῖθεν, and seems therefore to have read לך instead of לכם, and אודע instead of אועד.—The verb ונקדש, in ver. 43, can-

all *things* which I have commanded thee; seven days shalt thou consecrate them. 36. And thou shalt offer every day a bullock *for* a sin-offering for atonement; and thou shalt [1]expiate the altar, [2]by making an atonement for it; and thou shalt anoint it, to hallow it. 37. Seven days thou shalt make an atonement for the altar, and hallow it; and the altar shall be most holy; [3]whosoever toucheth the altar [4]must be holy.—38. Now this *is that* which thou shalt offer upon the altar: two lambs of the first year, every day continually. 39. The one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning; and the other lamb thou shalt offer [5]at dusk. 40. And a tenth deal of fine flour, [6]poured over with the fourth part of a hin of beaten oil, and the fourth part of a hin of wine *for* a libation *shall be* to the one lamb. 41. And the second lamb thou shalt offer at dusk, and thou shalt [7]offer thereto like the oblation of the morning, and like its libation, for a sweet odour, an offering made by fire to the Lord. 42. *This shall be* the continual burnt-offering throughout your generations, *at* the door of the Tabernacle of Meeting, before the Lord, where I will meet you, to speak there to thee. 43. And there I will meet with the children of Israel, that it be hallowed by my glory. 44. And I will hallow the Tabernacle of Meeting, and the altar; and Aaron and his sons I will hallow to serve me as priests. 45. And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God. 46. And they shall know that I *am* the Lord their God, who brought them out of the land of Egypt, that I may dwell among them: I *am* the Lord their God.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Cleanse. [2] When thou hast made an atonement for it. [3] Whatsoever. [4] Shall. [5] At even. [6] Mingled. [7] Do.

not be referred to בני ישראל, for this would require the plural form; but belongs to the substantive אהל מועד, which is implied in שמה, and which is, with the same verb, mentioned in the subsequent verse. Therefore, both the free translation of the Septuagint: *καὶ ἁγιασθήσομαι ἐν δόξῃ μου*, and the addition of *altare* by the Vulgate, are incorrect. Nor is it necessary to take ונקדש quite impersonally: "then sanctification shall be effected," which would be too indistinct, and convey scarcely a clear idea.

ל 1 וְעָשִׂיתָ מִזְבֵּחַ מִקְטַר קְטֹרֶת עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתוֹ׃
2 אַמָּה אָרְכּוֹ וְאַמָּה רָחְבּוֹ רָבוּעַ יִהְיֶה וְאַמָּתַיִם קֹמָתוֹ מִמֶּנּוּ קַרְנֹתָיו׃
3 וְצִפִּיתָ אֹתוֹ זָהָב טָהוֹר אֶת־גַּגּוֹ וְאֶת־קִירֹתָיו סָבִיב וְאֶת־
קַרְנֹתָיו וְעָשִׂיתָ לּוֹ זֵר זָהָב סָבִיב׃ 4 וּשְׁתֵּי טַבְּעֹת זָהָב תַּעֲשֶׂה־לּוֹ ׀
מִתַּחַת לְזֵרוֹ עַל שְׁתֵּי צַלְעֹתָיו תַּעֲשֶׂה עַל־שְׁנֵי צִדָּיו וְהָיָה לְבָתִּים
לְבַדִּים לָשֵׂאת אֹתוֹ בָּהֵמָּה׃ 5 וְעָשִׂיתָ אֶת־הַבַּדִּים עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים
וְצִפִּיתָ אֹתָם זָהָב׃ 6 וְנָתַתָּה אֹתוֹ לִפְנֵי הַפָּרֹכֶת אֲשֶׁר עַל־אֲרֹן
הָעֵדֻת לִפְנֵי הַכַּפֹּרֶת אֲשֶׁר עַל־הָעֵדֻת אֲשֶׁר אִוָּעֵד לְךָ שָׁמָּה׃
7 וְהִקְטִיר עָלָיו אַהֲרֹן קְטֹרֶת סַמִּים בַּבֹּקֶר בַּבֹּקֶר בְּהֵיטִיבוֹ אֶת־
הַנֵּרֹת יַקְטִירֶנָּה׃ מפטיר 8 וּבְהַעֲלֹת אַהֲרֹן אֶת־הַנֵּרֹת בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם

CHAPTER XXX.

SUMMARY. The altar of incense, the ceremonies to be performed on it, and the kinds of incense exclusively to be used, are described (vers. 1—10, 34—38). A census of the people is ordered, on which occasion every Israelite above twenty years is to give half a shekel as ransom-money, to be applied for the purposes of the Tabernacle (vers. 11—16). Further, the brazen laver in the Court (vers. 17—21), and the preparation and ingredients of the holy anointing oil, are described (vers. 22—33).

1. The place which the precept concerning the altar of incense occupies, after the specification of the garments and the consecration of the priests, has been justified in the note on xxvi. 35. The altar of incense must, therefore, have a necessary internal connection with those ministrations, which point to the true and proper mission of the priests; and its very position illustrates its end and tendency. It stood in the Holy; on the one side it corresponded with the altar of burnt-offerings in the Court; and, on the other, with the ark and mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies (ver. 6); it was separated from either by a vail; and yet all these three implements stood in one straight line, almost the middle of which formed the altar of incense. Further, the latter was, properly speaking, no *altar* (מזבח); no sacrifices were allowed to be killed on it; it was evidently only called so on account of its *internal* resemblance with the altar of burnt-offerings; as, in fact, both were square and provided with horns; and burnt-offerings and incense were burnt daily. But, on the other hand, the latter was covered with brass; the former, with gold; and, in this respect, the altar of incense was superior to that of burnt-offerings. However, the mercy-seat was entirely of gold, whilst the frame-work of the altar of incense was of acacia wood; the former was further distinguished by the Cherubim, those emblems of the Divine presence; and by the circumstance, that the High-priest only was permitted to approach it. The altar of incense is, therefore, inferior to the mercy-seat in holiness. But the resemblance between both lies in the fact, that they were equally destined to receive the blood of expiation of the sin-offerings; and that incense rose upon them; with that difference, that, on the mercy-seat, the blood of the sin-offering

CHAP. XXX. 1. And thou shalt make an altar for burning incense; *of* acacia wood shalt thou make it. 2. A cubit *shall be* its length, and a cubit its breadth; square shall it be; and two cubits *shall be* its height; its horns *shall be* of the same. 3. And thou shalt overlay it *with* pure gold, its top, and its sides round about, and its horns; and thou shalt make to it a crown of gold round about. 4. And two golden rings shalt thou make to it under its crown, at its two corners upon its two sides shalt thou make *them;* and they shall be for places for the staves to bear it with them. 5. And thou shalt make the staves *of* acacia wood, and overlay them *with* gold. 6. And thou shalt place it before the vail which *is* by the ark of the testimony, before the mercy-seat which *is* over the testimony, where I will meet with thee. 7. And Aaron shall burn thereon incense of perfumes every morning, when he dresseth the lamps he shall burn it. 8. And when Aaron [2]puts on the lamps [3]at dusk, he shall burn it, a perpetual incense before the Lord throughout your generations.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Sweet incense. [2] Lighteth or setteth up. [3] At even.

for the whole people of Israel was, once in the year, sprinkled on the Day of Atonement, but on the horns of the altar of incense, for the High-priest and the congregation, whenever they had occasion to bring a sin-offering (Lev. iv.). These comparisons will serve to explain the meaning of the altar of incense, and the relative signification of the three parts of the holy Tabernacle; but this subject will find its fuller and more comprehensive elucidation in the exposition of Leviticus. The description of the altar of incense, see p. 483. It was also called מזבח הפנימי, "the inner altar," in opposition to the altar of the Court.

2. It was one cubit long and broad, but two cubits high; and formed, therefore, like the Tabernacle itself, a double cube. Its horns were, like those of the outer altar, out of one piece with it.

3. The top or upper surface (גג), naturally required plating with metal, on account of the burning coals, which were placed on it from the altar of burnt-offerings.

4. צלעתיו are the corners, צדיו the sides of the altar; so that the rings were fastened in the angles on both sides.

6. It was placed "before the vail" of the Holy of Holies, that is, as the next words explain, "before the mercy-seat"; which was, as we have shown, in one line with it, though separated from it by the vail; it is very significant, that the position of the altar of incense is described with regard to the mercy-seat, with which it has an internal analogy (compare Heb. ix. 4; Rev. viii. 3); and those commentators who suppose that כפרת is here written instead of פרכת, "by mistake," are as rash in their conjectures as they are superficial in their explanations. It is a convenient way of expounding, to suppose, in every more difficult passage, an interpolation, a gloss, a mistake, a transposition, or a similar corruption of the text. But this is a very questionable

יַקְטִירֶנָּה קְטֹרֶת תָּמִיד לִפְנֵי יְהוָה לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם׃ 9 לֹא־תַעֲלוּ עָלָיו
קְטֹרֶת זָרָה וְעֹלָה וּמִנְחָה וְנֶסֶךְ לֹא תִסְּכוּ עָלָיו׃ 10 וְכִפֶּר אַהֲרֹן עַל־
קַרְנֹתָיו אַחַת בַּשָּׁנָה מִדַּם חַטַּאת הַכִּפֻּרִים אַחַת בַּשָּׁנָה יְכַפֵּר עָלָיו
לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם קֹדֶשׁ־קָדָשִׁים הוּא לַיהוָה׃ פ

method, even in the explanation of profane writings, and much more in commenting on the Holy Scriptures.

9. Every incense which was not prepared in the manner prescribed in vers. 34—38, is called *strange* and unholy, and was, therefore, to be excluded from the altar, on which, besides, no other sacrifice or libation was to be offered.

10. On the Day of Atonement, the

פ פ פ

11 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 12 כִּי תִשָּׂא אֶת־רֹאשׁ בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל
לִפְקֻדֵיהֶם וְנָתְנוּ אִישׁ כֹּפֶר נַפְשׁוֹ לַיהוָה בִּפְקֹד אֹתָם וְלֹא־יִהְיֶה
בָהֶם נֶגֶף בִּפְקֹד אֹתָם׃ 13 זֶה ׀ יִתְּנוּ כָּל־הָעֹבֵר עַל־הַפְּקֻדִים
מַחֲצִית הַשֶּׁקֶל בְּשֶׁקֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ עֶשְׂרִים גֵּרָה הַשֶּׁקֶל מַחֲצִית
הַשֶּׁקֶל תְּרוּמָה לַיהוָה׃ 14 כֹּל הָעֹבֵר עַל־הַפְּקֻדִים מִבֶּן עֶשְׂרִים
שָׁנָה וָמָעְלָה יִתֵּן תְּרוּמַת יְהוָה׃ 15 הֶעָשִׁיר לֹא־יַרְבֶּה וְהַדַּל לֹא
יַמְעִיט מִמַּחֲצִית הַשָּׁקֶל לָתֵת אֶת־תְּרוּמַת יְהוָה לְכַפֵּר עַל־
נַפְשֹׁתֵיכֶם׃ 16 וְלָקַחְתָּ אֶת־כֶּסֶף הַכִּפֻּרִים מֵאֵת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְנָתַתָּ

11—16. God commands Moses, that when he numbers the people of Israel, every man shall give "a ransom for his soul to the Lord, that there be no plague among them." This is a remarkable precept, which has received more than one strange interpretation. That it has been dictated by the ancient superstition of the "evil eye" (עין הרע), which is dangerous to a numbered multitude, and the calamitous effects of which the ransom was intended to avert, this idea can scarcely be attributed to Moses, as it is tantamount to the recognition of an evil genius. But our text leaves us scarcely in doubt as to the true meaning of that command. In taking a census of the people every individual is personally distinguished as a member of the holy nation, of the kingdom of priests; in being enrolled among this favoured community, he ought to become conscious how little he possesses the qualities of a theocratical citizen; the census is, therefore, to every one individually, both an admonition to turn his mind to sanctity and fear of God, and an exhortation to repent and to atone for his transgressions; and therefore half a shekel was given as a sign of that craving after internal purity, such as behoves a covenantee of God; and that gift, which was applied for the holy service, was thus "a memorial before the Lord." But every numbering implies likewise an examination of the numbered on the part of God; the Hebrew word פקד combines, in fact, both significations; and as they are only

9. You shall offer no strange incense thereon, nor burnt-sacrifice, nor oblation; nor shall you pour libation thereon. 10. And Aaron shall make an atonement upon its horns once in a year, with the blood of the sin-offering of atonement; once in the year shall he make atonement upon it throughout your generations: it *is* most holy to the Lord.

blood was, necessarily, sprinkled on the horns of this altar (Lev. xvi. 18—20); in the course of the year, it was only done, if a sin-offering was brought for the High-priest or for the congregation (Lev. iv. 7, 18).

11. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying: 12. When thou takest the sum of the children of Israel after their number, then shall they give *every* man a ransom for his soul to the Lord, when thou numberest them; that there be no plague among them, when *thou* numberest them. 13. This they shall give, every one who passeth to those who are numbered, half a shekel, after the shekel of the sanctuary, *of* twenty gerahs the shekel; half a shekel *shall be* the offering for the Lord. 14. Every one who passeth to those who are numbered, from twenty years old and above, shall give the offering of the Lord. 15. The rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less than half a shekel, to give the offering of the Lord, to make an atonement for your souls. 16. And thou shalt take the atonement money from the children of Israel, and thou shalt give it for the service of the [1]Tent of Meeting,

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Tabernacle of the congregation.

numbered in order to be included among the holy nation, it is to be feared that many will be found unworthy of being admitted; that they will be destroyed; that "there will be a plague" in Israel; and as a symbol that they are earnestly willing to render themselves worthy of this high privilege, the half shekel is given as a ransom, which is, therefore, indeed "atonement-money." An undeniable proof that this half-shekel is only a symbol, lies in the precept that the rich shall not give more, nor the poor less; all are equally sinful, equally unworthy of being God's servants; all require atonement and expiation.—Thus the external necessity of providing the means for defraying the expences of the holy service, was made subservient to a sublime act of self-examination and correction; Mosaism leaves at every step marks of its high spirituality.—Less acceptable appears the reason, that by the census the vanity and pride of the individuals are nourished, and that the ransom is given in order to remind them

אֹתוֹ עַל־עֲבֹדַת אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וְהָיָה לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְזִכָּרוֹן לִפְנֵי יְהֹוָה
לְכַפֵּר עַל־נַפְשֹׁתֵיכֶם׃ פ
17 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהֹוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 18 וְעָשִׂיתָ כִּיּוֹר נְחֹשֶׁת וְכַנּוֹ
נְחֹשֶׁת לְרָחְצָה וְנָתַתָּ אֹתוֹ בֵּין־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וּבֵין הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְנָתַתָּ
שָׁמָּה מָיִם׃ 19 וְרָחֲצוּ אַהֲרֹן וּבָנָיו מִמֶּנּוּ אֶת־יְדֵיהֶם וְאֶת־רַגְלֵיהֶם׃
20 בְּבֹאָם אֶל־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד יִרְחֲצוּ־מַיִם וְלֹא יָמֻתוּ אוֹ בְגִשְׁתָּם אֶל־
הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לְשָׁרֵת לְהַקְטִיר אִשֶּׁה לַיהֹוָה׃ 21 וְרָחֲצוּ יְדֵיהֶם
וְרַגְלֵיהֶם וְלֹא יָמֻתוּ וְהָיְתָה לָהֶם חָק־עוֹלָם לוֹ וּלְזַרְעוֹ
לְדֹרֹתָם׃ פ
22 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהֹוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 23 וְאַתָּה קַח־לְךָ בְּשָׂמִים רֹאשׁ
מָר־דְּרוֹר חֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת וְקִנְּמָן־בֶּשֶׂם מַחֲצִיתוֹ חֲמִשִּׁים וּמָאתָיִם

that they owe their existence to God alone.—On the value of the shekel, see note on xxi. 32. It is expressly added, that the ransom shall be "half a shekel of the *holy* shekel"; this contribution was employed for holiness, and was intended to produce holiness.

17—21. THE BRAZEN LAVER; see p. 484. כֵּן is the *base* of the laver, not the cover, as some assert (*De Dieu* and others), who believe that a lid was necessary to keep the water clean, since the laver stood in the open Court. But that meaning of כן is doubtful.—As washing the hands and feet typified purity of conduct, and sanctity of life, the priest who neglected these ablutions incurred the penalty of capital punishment; and this law is enjoined with an emphasis which renders it indisputable that it contains no mere ceremony, but an important moral precept.

22—33. The anointing oil is to consist of olive oil mixed with four ingredients, distinguished by their fragrance and costliness. As the incense also consisted of four component parts, it is obvious, that this number here alludes likewise, to perfection and wholeness. The circular form was everywhere excluded; the Tabernacle and all its implements, hangings, and curtains, had the square form; and we have seen that the same number prevails in the priestly vestments; it is therefore significant, and points, in this instance, to perfect, undivided, and undefiled holiness. The four ingredients are:

I. MYRRH (מר, σμύρνα, μύῤῥα) is an aromatic plant, used not only as a fumigator, but as a perfume for garments, beds, for embalming the dead, as an ointment, and also for medicines. It is not found in Palestine, except, perhaps, in gardens; but in Arabia, Ethiopia, and Abyssinia. It was very much esteemed by the ancient nations, especially the Orientals, and was known to them in several varieties (Stacte, Gabirea, Troglodytica, etc., *Plin.* xii. 35; *Diosc.* i. 73). It was applied either as a gum for fumigating, or liquid, as the chief ingredient of a very costly ointment; it was even admixed to wine, to enhance its spicy taste; and an extremely strengthening power is attributed to such wine. The gum either exudes of its own accord (this is the מר דרור of our text, identical with מר עובר in Cant. v. 5: "spontaneous myrrh," and is of superior quality;

that it may be a memorial to the children of Israel before the Lord, to make an atonement for your souls.—17. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying: 18. Thou shalt also make a laver *of* brass, and its base *of* brass, for washing; and thou shalt place it between the Tent of Meeting and between the altar, and thou shalt put water therein. 19. And Aaron and his sons shall wash thereat their hands and their feet: 20. When they go into the Tent of Meeting, they shall wash *with* water, that they may not die; or when they approach to the altar to minister, to burn an offering made by fire to the Lord: 21. So they shall wash their hands and their feet, that they may not die; and it shall be a statute for ever to them, *even* to him and to his seed throughout their generations.—22. Moreover, the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 23. Take thou also to thyself principal spices, *of* pure myrrh five hundred *shekels*, and *of* sweet cinnamon half so much, two hundred

Sept. σμύρνη ἐκλεκτή), or from incisions made in the rind. The season when it is obtained most plentifully is in July and August. The description which the ancient writers have furnished of this tree or shrub do by no means agree; since Ehrenberg's accurate observations it has received the name Balsamodendron Myrrha; its bark is smooth, pale, greyish; the leaves and the stem are yellowish white; the former are oval, trifoliate, and stand on short, smooth peduncles, either singly or in clusters. The fruits are ovally pointed, and brown; the resin is at first oily and whitish, but changes gradually into yellow, and assumes, in hardening, a reddish colour.—Other descriptions, see in *Pliny*, xii. 15; *Diosc.* i. 78; *Diod.* v. 41; *Celsius*, Hierob. i. 520, *et seq.*; *Rosenmüller*, Alterth. IV. i. 159.

II. Cinnamon (קִנָּמוֹן, κίνναμον), an aromatic rind, imported by the Phœnicians, or, as others believe, by the Arabians, was much used for perfumes and ointments. The cinnamon-tree (Laurus cinnamomum, called *Korunda-gauhah* by the inhabitants of Ceylon) grows in East India, chiefly in Ceylon (Taprobane), but, at present, also on the Malabar coast, in the islands of Sumatra, in Borneo, China, and Cochin-China. But the best sort is found in Ceylon, on the south-western coast, where the soil is light and sandy, and the atmosphere moist from the prevalent southern winds. The plants begin to yield cinnamon when about six or seven years old, after which the shoots may be cut every three or four years. The cinnamon-tree is only since the last century more accurately known, as strangers were not permitted access into the interior of Ceylon, where the cinnamon-groves occur. On the coast it is generally about twenty to thirty feet high, but reaches a much greater height in the groves; its stem is about three feet in circumference. The wood is inodorous, soft, and white, and is applied for very various uses. The boughs are very numerous; the leaves, originally almost scarlet red, become bright green, are oval, resembling the laurel, and four to six inches long; the blossoms are whitish, of agreeable smell, but not aromatic; in April they develop themselves into oval

וּקְנֵה־בֹשֶׂם חֲמִשִּׁים וּמָאתָיִם׃ 24 וְקִדָּה חֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת בְּשֶׁקֶל
הַקֹּדֶשׁ וְשֶׁמֶן זַיִת הִין׃ 25 וְעָשִׂיתָ אֹתוֹ שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת־קֹדֶשׁ רֹקַח
מִרְקַחַת מַעֲשֵׂה רֹקֵחַ שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת־קֹדֶשׁ יִהְיֶה׃ 26 וּמָשַׁחְתָּ
בוֹ אֶת־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וְאֵת אֲרוֹן הָעֵדֻת׃ 27 וְאֶת־הַשֻּׁלְחָן וְאֶת־
כָּל־כֵּלָיו וְאֶת־הַמְּנֹרָה וְאֶת־כֵּלֶיהָ וְאֵת מִזְבַּח הַקְּטֹרֶת׃ 28 וְאֶת־
מִזְבַּח הָעֹלָה וְאֶת־כָּל־כֵּלָיו וְאֶת־הַכִּיֹּר וְאֶת־כַּנּוֹ׃ 29 וְקִדַּשְׁתָּ אֹתָם
וְהָיוּ קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים כָּל־הַנֹּגֵעַ בָּהֶם יִקְדָּשׁ׃ 30 וְאֶת־אַהֲרֹן וְאֶת־בָּנָיו
תִּמְשָׁח וְקִדַּשְׁתָּ אֹתָם לְכַהֵן לִי׃ 31 וְאֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל תְּדַבֵּר
לֵאמֹר שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת־קֹדֶשׁ יִהְיֶה זֶה לִי לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם׃ 32 עַל־בְּשַׂר
אָדָם לֹא יִיסָךְ וּבְמַתְכֻּנְתּוֹ לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ כָּמֹהוּ קֹדֶשׁ הוּא קֹדֶשׁ יִהְיֶה

fruits, resembling those of the juniper-tree; they ripen in June, are neither in smell nor in taste similar to the cinnamon; but, if boiled, they secrete an oil, which becomes hard, white, and fragrant; it is frequently used for ointments, and applied to wounds; it is burnt in lamps, and, especially for the use of the king and the churches, prepared into candles, which, in burning, diffuse a most agreeable smell. The stem and the boughs of the cinnamon-tree are surrounded with a double rind; the exterior one is whitish or grey, and almost inodorous and tasteless; but the inner one, which consists, properly, of two closely-connected rinds, furnishes, if dried in the sun, that much-valued brown cinnamon, which is imported to us in the shape of thin fine barks, eight or ten of which, rolled one into the other, form sometimes one quill. This inner rind is, in our text, designated קנמן בשם, "spicy cinnamon." From the coarser pieces, an oil of cinnamon is obtained (see *Ritter*, Erdkunde VI. iv. 2, 123, *et seq.*; *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. ii. 734; *Royle*, in Kitto's Cycl. ii. p. 210, *et seq.*).

III. Calamus (קנה בשם, or קנה הטוב, or simply קנה; κάλαμος ἀρωματικός; Calamus odoratus) was, from early times, known to the ancients. Its root was very highly prized as a spice, especially of those species which grow in Arabia and India; those which occur in Europe were less esteemed. It is also said to have been found in a valley of Mount Lebanon (*Polyb.* v. 46; *Strab.* xvi. 4). Ointments and fumigations were generally prepared from it. The plant has a reed-like stem, which is extremely fragrant, like the leaves, especially when bruised. It is of a tawny colour, much jointed, breaking into splinters, and having the hollow stem filled with pith like the web of a spider (compare *Theophr.*, Plant. ix. 7; *Plin.* xii. 12, 48; *Diod. Sic.*, ii. 49; *Diosc.* i. 17; *Celsius*, Hierob. ii. 326, *et seq.*). It was much valued among the Hebrews (Cant. iv. 14; Isa. xliii. 24); and was from India imported to Palestine (Jer. vi. 20; xxvii. 19).

IV. Cassia (קדה, of the same genus as קציעה, cassia) is extensively mentioned by ancient writers as an aromatic rind, which was mixed as an ingredient with fragrant ointments; among its different varieties, one is named κιττώ, which is, perhaps, identical with קדה (*Diosc.* i. 12). Cassia oil and cassia buds are likewise mentioned. The shrub is said to grow in India and Arabia; it is certainly not the Laurus cassia of Malabar; for this is only a wild species of the Cinnamon Ceylonicum. Nor is cassia merely dis-

and fifty *shekels*, and *of* sweet calamus two hundred and
fifty *shekels*. 24. And of cassia five hundred *shekels*, after
the shekel of the sanctuary, and *of* olive-oil one hin:
25. And thou shalt make it an oil of holy ointment, an
ointment compounded after the art of the spicer: and it shall
be a holy anointing oil. 26. And thou shalt anoint the
Tent of Meeting therewith, and the ark of the testimony;
27. And the table and all its vessels, and the candlestick
and its vessels, and the altar of incense; 28. And the
altar of burnt-offering with all its vessels, and the laver
and its base. 29. And thou shalt hallow them, that they
may be most holy; [2]whosoever toucheth them must be
holy. 30. And thou shalt anoint Aaron and his sons,
and hallow them to serve me as priests. 31. And thou
shalt speak to the children of Israel, saying, This shall be
a holy anointing oil to me throughout your generations.
32. Upon man's flesh shall it not be poured, nor shall you

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Whatsoever toucheth them shall be holy.

tinguished from cinnamon "by the outer cellular covering of bark being scraped off the latter, but allowed to remain on the former. At present, cassia-bark is frequently sold instead of cinnamon; it has the same general appearance, smell, and taste; but its substance is thicker and coarser, its colour darker, its flavour much less sweet and fine than that of Ceylon cinnamon" (*Royle, loc. cit.* ii. 212). It is imported from Bombay, Calcutta, Batavia, Singapore, etc.

The quantity of each of these spices to be mixed with the pure olive-oil was, of myrrh and cassia, five hundred shekels, and of cinnamon and calamus, two hundred and fifty. That shekels are meant, not a smaller weight, is evident, from ver. 24, where it is expressly mentioned, with the addition, that it should be the *holy* shekel, which points again to the sacred use for which this ointment was intended (משחת קדש, ver. 25). To prepare such unctions, a certain knowledge and skill was necessary; and a man who possessed this skill was a רוקח, *a seasoner* (from רקח, one who mixes spices for the preparation of ointment). With this oil, the whole tent, and all its vessels and implements, were to be anointed; thereby the one was marked as a holy place, the others as holy instruments; they were devoted to sanctity; the Divine power rested upon them; the Spirit of God filled them.—The form יִיסָךְ (ver. 32) is obviously the future Kal of יסך, which is kindred with נסך and סוך, to pour, and which is treated like a verb originally פ״י, as יִיצֶר, from יצר, etc.; and the words על־בשר אדם לא ייסך must, therefore, be translated: "one shall not pour it on the body of another man," or "it shall not be poured"; the use of the third person in the active, in an impersonal signification, is a Hebraism which we have already noticed several times. It is, therefore, neither necessary to read יוסך instead of ייסך, after the analogy of Genesis I. 26, where the Keri reads ויושם instead of ויישם; nor is it the Hophal of סוך, which would likewise demand this deviation from the received text.—מתכנת is here the proportion of ingredients or component parts to each other; that it originally

לָכֶם׃ 33 אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִרְקַח כָּמֹהוּ וַאֲשֶׁר יִתֵּן מִמֶּנּוּ עַל־זָר וְנִכְרַת
מֵעַמָּיו׃ ס 34 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה
קַח־לְךָ סַמִּים נָטָף ׀ וּשְׁחֵלֶת וְחֶלְבְּנָה סַמִּים וּלְבֹנָה זַכָּה בַּד בְּבַד

means only quantity, or number, has been observed on v. 8.—The *stranger* who is here (ver. 33) forbidden to prepare, or to apply, ointments mixed of the same four substances just enumerated, is the Israelite who is not of the family of Aaron, like in xxix. 33; who acts contrary to this injunction is threatened with excision from the holy nation, that is, as he apparently does not respect the command and promise of God, who attributed to that ointment a purifying and sanctifying power, he forfeits his right of enjoying any longer the immediate sovereignty and guidance of the Holy One.

34. The Sacred Incense was mixed of the following four ingredients:

I. Storax (נָטָף, storax officinalis). It grows free in Syria, Palestine, Arabia, Asia Minor, Ethiopia, and the southern parts of Europe; the leaves are oval, villose at the nether side, pedunculate, 2 inches long, and 1½ inch broad; the tree attains a height of 12 to 20 feet, and produces a considerable number of thin boughs. The flowers are snow-white, sit in clusters at the extremity of the boughs, and spread a very agreeable odour; they bring forth small nuts, which contain two hard smooth kernels, of a strong taste. From the stem distils either spontaneously, or by incisions, a gum-like resin, which is transparent, pale-red or brownish, soft, and very fragrant, which was mixed with perfumes and ointments, and was also applied for medical purposes (compare *Plin.*, xii. 55; *Theophr.*, Plant. ix. 7; *Diosc.* i. 80). Now נטף is the storax-gum, whilst the לבנה seems to denote the tree; but the former is probably not the stacte (as the Sept., Vulg., and others render), which appears to be the sweet-smelling gum, which distils of its own accord from the myrrh, which is in ver. 23, introduced under the name מר דרר, and of which it is even uncertain whether it was, as a hard substance, used for fumigations (*Winer*, Bibl. Dict. ii. 512, 535). The other translations, as balsam, liquid styrax, benzoin, costus, mastich, bdellium, are either still more indistinct or inaccurate.

II. Onycha (שחלת, blatta Byzantina; Sept. ὄνυξ; Onk. טופרא), is properly the crustaceous covering of the shells of certain species of shell-fish (trochus and conus), which has some resemblance with the human nail, and which has given the name to that substance (it is called by the Arabs "the claw of the devil"). It is found in the waters of India and Arabia, and is frequently used as an ingredient for incense; for although it is, in itself, by no means of fragrant smell, it enhances it if it is intermixed with other perfumes. The selection of such substance for the holy incense may have a symbolical meaning; it may signify that the sin or worthlessness of the individual does not destroy the love which God bears to Israel as a nation; that, on the contrary, His compassion and long-sufferance is strengthened if He sees the frailty and the weakness of human nature;—but we lay no stress upon an interpretation which is not based on a clear Biblical statement, and which is, in fact, superfluous, as it suffices to know, that the onycha indeed produces, in composition with the other parts, a greater fragrance.—But it is equally unnecessary to understand, with Rashi, Baehr, and others, by onycha a *root*, resembling the nail, or with Bochart, the resin *bdellium* (compare *Diosc.*, ii. 10; *Bochart*, Hieroz. iii. 796; *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. ii. 594).

III. Galbanum (חלבנה; Septuagint, χαλβάνη; Vulg. Galbanum), is the resin of the jointed, thorny, umbelliferous shrub stagonitis (perhaps Bubon Galbanum, or Galbanum officinale of Don; Opoidia galbanifera of Lindley) which grows in

make *any other* like it after its proportion; it *is* holy; holy shall it be to you. 33. Whosoever compoundeth *any* like it, or whosoever putteth *any* of it upon a stranger, he shall be cut off from his people.—34. And the Lord said to Moses, Take to thyself spices, [1]storax, onycha, and galbanum; *these* sweet spices with pure frankincense; one part

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Stacte.

Abyssinia, Arabia, Syria, and Kurdistan; it is obtained by incisions in the rind; it is fat (whence the Hebrew name חלבנה), glutinous, of the consistence of wax, brownish or brownish-yellow, with white spots in the interior, which are the agglutinated tears, of a strong, but disagreeable, warm and bitter odour, by which serpents and reptiles were expelled, and the bees forced from their hives. The most known variety is the Galbanum Persicum, which is said to come from Peru. Like onycha, it is, when burnt separately, of no agreeable odour, but if added to other ingredients of incense, it both strengthens the smell, and retains it longer. In medicine it was used as a stimulant and for antispasmodic drugs, as it is still employed for external application to reduce indolent tumours (compare *Plin.* ix. 58; xii. 56; who further observes that it is obtained from the mountain Amanus in Syria, and issues out of a herb-like fennel-geant, and that the best sort of galbanum is grisly, clear, and resembling ammoniacum; *Virgil*, Georg. iii. 415, 764; *Theophr.*, Plant. ix. 7, who writes that galbanum flows from a Panax of Syria; *Lucan.*, ix. 916; *Diosc.*, iii. 97, who calls it μετώπιον, and states, that it is an exudation produced by a ferula in Syria, and that it was often intermixed with the most fragrant substances, to strengthen the effect of the latter; *Celsius*, Hierob. i. 267, *et seq.; Rosenmüller*, Alterth. IV. i. 151; *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. i. 386; *Royle*, *loc. cit.* i. 420). Galbanum is at present imported from Bombay, whither it is first brought probably from the Persian Gulf.

IV. *Frankincense* (לבונה, λιβανωτός, λίβανος) was, as is well known, extensively used for fumigations and sacrifices, not only by the Romans, but by most of the ancient nations. It was imported to Palestine from Arabia Felix, especially from Sheba, which was considered as its native soil, although it occurs occasionally also in Palestine and Asia Minor, but scarcely in Persia or Syria. Modern travellers assert that Arabia produces only an inferior species of frankincense, that the best sorts occur in Hadhramaut, and that it is likewise found in India. The ancient naturalists differ considerably in the description of this plant, as they did not know it from personal examination (compare *Pliny*, xii. 31; *Theophr.*, Plant. ix. 4, who states that it has many boughs, like those of a pear-tree, although smaller, and a smooth bark; *Diod. Sic.*, v. 41, who remarks, that it is small, similar to the Egyptian hawthorn; that its leaves resemble those of the willow, and has yellow blossoms). It is represented as a shrub, growing on mountains, and thorny; it reaches a height of about five feet; its leaves and fruits are much like those of the myrtle. The different names which have been given to it, are: Amyris Kataf, Amary Kafal, Juniperus Thurifera, Boswellia Serrata (in India; it yields the olibanum Indicum, a yellowish, translucent resin, which has a bitter taste, but if burnt spreads an agreeable smell). According to Pliny (xii. 32) the frankincense is obtained by incisions twice in the year; the first time in the beginning of autumn; this sort is white and pure (לבנה זכה); and the second time in the winter, when it is of a reddish colour, and in quality much inferior to the former kind (compare *Diosc.*, i. 82; *Celsius*, Hierob. i. 231,

יִהְיֶה׃ 35 וְעָשִׂיתָ אֹתָהּ קְטֹרֶת רֹקַח מַעֲשֵׂה רוֹקֵחַ מְמֻלָּח טָהוֹר
קֹדֶשׁ׃ 36 וְשָׁחַקְתָּ מִמֶּנָּה הָדֵק וְנָתַתָּה מִמֶּנָּה לִפְנֵי הָעֵדֻת בְּאֹהֶל
מוֹעֵד אֲשֶׁר אִוָּעֵד לְךָ שָׁמָּה קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים תִּהְיֶה לָכֶם׃ 37 וְהַקְּטֹרֶת
אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשֶׂה בְּמַתְכֻּנְתָּהּ לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ לָכֶם קֹדֶשׁ תִּהְיֶה לְךָ לַיהוָה׃
38 אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲשֶׂה כָמוֹהָ לְהָרִיחַ בָּהּ וְנִכְרַת מֵעַמָּיו׃ ס

et seq.; *Winer*, Bibl. Dict. 681, *et seq.*).—בד בבד יהיה, "one part shall be like the other," literally, "a part shall be like a part"; the use of ב in the meaning of כ occurs likewise in חרש בחדש; שנה בשנה, etc.; compare *Ges.*, Thes. p. 173; and so the Sept., Vulg., and the Targumim. In vers. 23, 24, the proportion of the ingredients for the holy oil was stated; it was therefore necessary to mention in what manner the parts of the incense were to be mixed. The sense of these words is consequently not "every part separately" (Ebn Ezra, Abarbanel), or "accurately."

35. ממלח, *salted*, or with salt, an ingredient added to all sacrifices (Levit.

לא 1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 2 רְאֵה קָרָאתִי בְשֵׁם
בְּצַלְאֵל בֶּן־אוּרִי בֶן־חוּר לְמַטֵּה יְהוּדָה׃ 3 וָאֲמַלֵּא אֹתוֹ רוּחַ
אֱלֹהִים בְּחָכְמָה וּבִתְבוּנָה וּבְדַעַת וּבְכָל־מְלָאכָה׃ 4 לַחְשֹׁב
מַחֲשָׁבֹת לַעֲשׂוֹת בַּזָּהָב וּבַכֶּסֶף וּבַנְּחֹשֶׁת׃ 5 וּבַחֲרֹשֶׁת אֶבֶן
לְמַלֹּאת וּבַחֲרֹשֶׁת עֵץ לַעֲשׂוֹת בְּכָל־מְלָאכָה׃ 6 וַאֲנִי הִנֵּה נָתַתִּי
אִתּוֹ אֵת אָהֳלִיאָב בֶּן־אֲחִיסָמָךְ לְמַטֵּה־דָן וּבְלֵב כָּל־חֲכַם־לֵב נָתַתִּי
חָכְמָה וְעָשׂוּ אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִךָ׃ 7 אֵת ׀ אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וְאֶת־
הָאָרֹן לָעֵדֻת וְאֶת־הַכַּפֹּרֶת אֲשֶׁר עָלָיו וְאֵת כָּל־כְּלֵי הָאֹהֶל׃
8 וְאֶת־הַשֻּׁלְחָן וְאֶת־כֵּלָיו וְאֶת־הַמְּנֹרָה הַטְּהֹרָה וְאֶת־כָּל־כֵּלֶיהָ וְאֵת
מִזְבַּח הַקְּטֹרֶת׃ 9 וְאֶת־מִזְבַּח הָעֹלָה וְאֶת־כָּל־כֵּלָיו וְאֶת־הַכִּיּוֹר
וְאֶת־כַּנּוֹ׃ 10 וְאֵת בִּגְדֵי הַשְּׂרָד וְאֶת־בִּגְדֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ לְאַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן

CHAPTER XXXI.

SUMMARY. God appoints Bezaleel for the execution of the holy Tabernacle, its vessels, and the priestly garments; gives him Aholiab as an assistant, and fills, besides, many others with wisdom and skill for the sacred work. He repeats the law concerning the sanctification of the Sabbath, and delivers to Moses the two Tables of the Law.

3. See on xxviii. 3.

10. The בגדי השרד are neither the hangings, nor the curtains for wrapping up the holy vessels during the journeys; but, as the Septuagint, Onkelos, and Jonathan render, the *official garments* of

shall be like the other. 35. And thou shalt make it an incense, an ointment *of* the work of the ointment maker, [1] with salt, pure *and* holy. 36. And thou shalt beat *some* of it to powder, and put of it before the testimony in the Tent of Meeting, where I shall meet with thee; it shall be most holy to you. 37. And *as for* the incense which thou shalt make, you shall not make to yourselves according to its proportion; it shall be to thee holy for the Lord. 38. Whosoever shall make like it, to smell thereto, shall be cut off from his people.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Tempered together.

ii. 13; compare *Talm.*, Kerith. 6, *a*); not *mixed* or *tempered*.

37, 38. It is evident that the preparation of incense for *private* or *profane* use ("to smell thereto") was forbidden, but not its renewal for the holy sacrifice. The traditional opinions on this subject are excluded by the text.

Chap. XXXI. 1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. See, I have called by name Bezaleel, the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah: 3. And I have filled him with the spirit of God, with wisdom, and with understanding, and with knowledge, and with all manner of workmanship, 4. To devise skilful designs, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass, 5. And in cutting of stones, to set *them*, and in carving of timber, to work in all manner of workmanship. 6. And I, behold, have given with him Aholiab, the son of Ahisamach, of the tribe of Dan, and in the hearts of all who are wise-hearted I have put wisdom, that they may make all that which I have commanded thee: 7. The Tent of Meeting, and the ark for the testimony, and the mercy-seat which *is* upon it, and all the vessels of the Tabernacle, 8. And the table and its vessels, and the pure candlestick with all its vessels, and the altar of incense, 9. And the altar of burnt-offering with all its vessels, and the laver and its base, 10. And the [1] garments of office; namely the holy garments of Aaron the priest, and the garments of his

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—The cloths of service.

the priests, which are qualified by the succeeding words, ואת בגדי הקדש; for ו is frequently added if an explanatory term follows an unusual expression; in xxxv.

וְאֶת־בִּגְדֵי בָנָיו לְכַהֵן׃ 11 וְאֵת שֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה וְאֶת־קְטֹרֶת הַסַּמִּים
לַקֹּדֶשׁ כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר־צִוִּיתִךָ יַעֲשׂוּ׃ פ
12 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 13 וְאַתָּה דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
לֵאמֹר אַךְ אֶת־שַׁבְּתֹתַי תִּשְׁמֹרוּ כִּי אוֹת הִוא בֵּינִי וּבֵינֵיכֶם
לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם לָדַעַת כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה מְקַדִּשְׁכֶם׃ 14 וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּת
כִּי קֹדֶשׁ הִוא לָכֶם מְחַלְלֶיהָ מוֹת יוּמָת כִּי כָּל־הָעֹשֶׂה בָהּ מְלָאכָה
וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהִוא מִקֶּרֶב עַמֶּיהָ׃ 15 שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים יֵעָשֶׂה מְלָאכָה
וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה כָּל־הָעֹשֶׂה מְלָאכָה בְּיוֹם
הַשַּׁבָּת מוֹת יוּמָת׃ 16 וְשָׁמְרוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּת לַעֲשׂוֹת
אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּת לְדֹרֹתָם בְּרִית עוֹלָם׃ 17 בֵּינִי וּבֵין בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אוֹת
הִוא לְעֹלָם כִּי־שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ
וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שָׁבַת וַיִּנָּפַשׁ׃ ס שני 18 וַיִּתֵּן
אֶל־מֹשֶׁה כְּכַלֹּתוֹ לְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ בְּהַר סִינַי שְׁנֵי לֻחֹת הָעֵדֻת לֻחֹת
אֶבֶן כְּתֻבִים בְּאֶצְבַּע אֱלֹהִים׃

19, and xxxix. 41, the ו is omitted; and this latter passage, together with xxxix. 1, is decisive.

13—17. The law about Sabbath is here emphatically repeated (אך, ver. 13), to remind the Israelites, that the holy service in the Tabernacle cannot supersede the observance of the Sabbath, but that it receives its true value only by the latter, which is the source of spiritual life, and the means of deliverance from materialism. We have treated of this momentous passage in the notes on xx. 8—11.

18. That important documents were,

לב 1 וַיַּרְא הָעָם כִּי־בֹשֵׁשׁ מֹשֶׁה לָרֶדֶת מִן־הָהָר וַיִּקָּהֵל הָעָם עַל־

CHAPTERS XXXII. to XXXIV.

Summary. When the people despaired of Moses' return, after an absence of forty days, they urged Aaron to make a golden calf, as an image of their God who had brought them from Egypt. They gave their gold trinkets and ornaments; the calf was made, an altar erected, and a feast was celebrated with dancing and immoderate joy (vers. 1—6). When God saw this He was indignant at the degeneracy of the ungrateful people; He intended to destroy them, and to create a great nation out of the descendants of Moses. But the latter implored God's mercy, reminded Him of His covenant concluded with the patriarchs, and of the promises solemnly guaranteed to them; and God revoked His decree concerning the extirpation of His people (ver. 7—14). Moses descends, hears the revelry of the multitude; in his anger he breaks the Tables of the Law, which God had given him; melts the calf, and reduces it to atoms, which he throws into the water, and causes the people to drink (ver. 15—20). He censures Aaron severely, who could only offer a very feeble excuse for his

sons, to minister, 11. And the anointing oil, and the incense of perfumes for the holy *place*, according to all which I have commanded thee, shall they do.—12. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 13. Speak thou also to the children of Israel, saying, Indeed, my Sabbaths you shall keep; for it *is* a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that you may know that I *am* the Lord who sanctifieth you. 14. Therefore you shall keep the Sabbath; for it *is* holy to you; he who defileth it shall surely be put to death; for whosoever doeth any work thereon, that soul shall be cut off from among its people. 15. Six days may work be done; and on the seventh *is* a [1]great rest-day, holy to the Lord; whosoever doeth *any* work on the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death. 16. Therefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, *for* an eternal covenant. 17. It *is* a sign between me and between the children of Israel for ever; for *in* six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day He rested, and was refreshed.—18. And He gave to Moses, when He had finished to speak to him on Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Sabbath of rest.

in ancient times, and still are, among Eastern nations, engraved on stone, is a fact too universally known to require any further illustration (compare Job xix. 24).—The *finger of God* is identical with the *power* of God, like in viii. 15; Psa. viii. 4.

CHAP. XXXII. 1. And when the people saw that Moses delayed to come down from the mount, the people

blameable weakness (ver.21—24). Then he invites those who are for the Lord to rally round him; the Levites respond to his call, and on his command kill three thousand of the sinners (ver. 25—29). Moses ascends to God, and prays that if He cannot forgive this faithlessness of the Israelites, He may destroy him in their stead; but God declares distinctly that He will only punish the actual sinners—and He sent a plague among the people (ver. 30—35). God further assures Moses, that He will deliver Canaan and its tribes into the hands of the Hebrews, but that He will effect this through a messenger, not by personal guidance, on account of the rebelliousness of the people—which announcement spreads consternation and grief in the camp; and the Israelites divest themselves of their golden ornaments (xxxiii. 1—6). Moses removes his tent without the camp; God communes with him there, which the people witness with reverence (ver. 7—11). Moses wishes to see the whole glory of God, who, however, reminds him that this is impossible to a human being, but promises to

אַהֲרֹן וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלָיו קוּם ׀ עֲשֵׂה־לָנוּ אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר יֵלְכוּ לְפָנֵינוּ כִּי־
זֶה ׀ מֹשֶׁה הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱלָנוּ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם לֹא יָדַעְנוּ מֶה־הָיָה
לוֹ׃ 2 וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם אַהֲרֹן פָּרְקוּ נִזְמֵי הַזָּהָב אֲשֶׁר בְּאָזְנֵי נְשֵׁיכֶם
בְּנֵיכֶם וּבְנֹתֵיכֶם וְהָבִיאוּ אֵלָי׃ 3 וַיִּתְפָּרְקוּ כָּל־הָעָם אֶת־נִזְמֵי
הַזָּהָב אֲשֶׁר בְּאָזְנֵיהֶם וַיָּבִיאוּ אֶל־אַהֲרֹן׃ 4 וַיִּקַּח מִיָּדָם וַיָּצַר אֹתוֹ
בַּחֶרֶט וַיַּעֲשֵׂהוּ עֵגֶל מַסֵּכָה וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלֶּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר
הֶעֱלוּךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 5 וַיַּרְא אַהֲרֹן וַיִּבֶן מִזְבֵּחַ לְפָנָיו וַיִּקְרָא
אַהֲרֹן וַיֹּאמַר חַג לַיהוָה מָחָר׃ 6 וַיַּשְׁכִּימוּ מִמָּחֳרָת וַיַּעֲלוּ עֹלֹת
וַיַּגִּשׁוּ שְׁלָמִים וַיֵּשֶׁב הָעָם לֶאֱכֹל וְשָׁתוֹ וַיָּקֻמוּ לְצַחֵק׃ פ
7 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֶךְ־רֵד כִּי שִׁחֵת עַמְּךָ אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱלֵיתָ מֵאֶרֶץ
מִצְרָיִם׃ 8 סָרוּ מַהֵר מִן־הַדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִם עָשׂוּ לָהֶם עֵגֶל מַסֵּכָה
וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ־לוֹ וַיִּזְבְּחוּ־לוֹ וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלֶּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱלוּךָ
מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃ 9 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה רָאִיתִי אֶת־הָעָם הַזֶּה

reveal to him all His attributes of mercy, and their influence upon the affairs of man (ver. 12—23). Accordingly, God commanded him to make two other tables of stone, and to ascend the mountain; God appeared to him in a cloud, and proclaimed His goodness and His justice (xxxiv. 1—8). Moses here repeats his entreaty, that God might Himself accompany the people; He promises it, renews the Covenant under the condition that they shall keep aloof from other gods, and observe the commandments and laws previously revealed (ver. 9—26). Moses stays with God forty days and forty nights, during which time he writes down those fundamental conditions. Then he returns to the people with the Tables of the Law; his face was radiant with the divine glory: therefore, whenever he did not commune with God, or speak to the people, he covered his face with a veil (ver. 27—35).

1—6. The prolonged absence of Moses was the only cause of the aberration of the golden calf, which they, in fact, did not intend as an idol, but as an image of the true God; they did not transgress the first, but the second commandment (see p. 346); אלהים means, therefore, here *God*, not *Gods*; and the verb ילכו corresponds with the plural *form* of אלהים, as in Gen. xx. 13; xxxv. 7; see ver. 4, with which compare Neh. ix. 18. The sin of the golden calf is rigorously reprehended in Ps. cvi. 19—23. According to tradition, it took place on the seventeenth day of Tammuz, a day which later became also more than once a day of national grief (*Talm.*, Thaan. 26, *b.*).—The ear-rings were an ornament worn by both men and women, they could therefore be collected in sufficient quantity; and this statement of the sacred text contains by no means "fabulous elements" (see p. 486). The opinion that Aaron asked just to bring the ear-rings, because he hoped that the people would not easily part with them, since they seem to have been esteemed as amulets (Gen. xxxv. 4), is not supported by any allusion of the text (see ver. 24). Aaron's unmanly compliance was indeed blameable, and is thus represented, not only in ver. 25, but with still stronger terms

assembled to Aaron, and said to him, Rise, make us [1]a god who shall go before us; for *as for* this Moses, the man who brought us out of the land of Egypt, we do not know what hath become of him. 2. And Aaron said to them, Take off the golden rings which *are* in the ears of your wives, of your sons, and of your daughters, and bring *them* to me. 3. And all the people took off the golden rings which *were* in their ears, and brought *them* to Aaron. 4. And he received *it* from their hands, and formed it with a graving-tool, and made it a molten calf; and they said, These *are* thy gods, O Israel, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt. 5. And when Aaron saw *it*, he built an altar before it; and Aaron proclaimed, and said, To-morrow *is* a feast to the Lord. 6. And they rose up early on the following day, and offered burnt-offerings, and brought peace-offerings; and the people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose to play.—7. And the Lord said to Moses, Go, descend, for thy people which thou hast brought out of the land of Egypt is depraved. 8. They have swerved quickly from the way which I have commanded them; they have made for themselves a molten calf, and have worshipped it, and have sacrificed thereto, and said, These *are* thy gods, O Israel, who have brought thee out of the land of Egypt. 9. And the Lord

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Gods.

in Deut. ix. 20; although he tried to remind the people, at least, of God's supremacy, by appointing a festival in honour of Him (ver. 5). The words ויצר אתו בחרט ויעשהו עגל מסכה must be explained: "and he formed it (the gold) with a graving tool, and made it a molten calf"; the root חרט (Greek, χαράττω) signifies too undoubtedly, "to engrave," to justify a deviation from this meaning; and the use of a chisel or any graving tool was necessary, although the calf was molten; Sept. ἐν γραφίδι, etc. Untenable are the interpretations: Aaron engraved hieroglyphic signs on the calf; or he made a drawing with a style; or he made a calf of wood and overlaid it with gold; or he tied the gold in a bag; or put it into a casket; all which expositions are contrary to the Hebrew words.—The calf which Aaron made was in imitation of the Egyptian Apis (Osiris in Memphis) or Mnevis (the sun in Heliopolis), but scarcely of Typhon, the evil genius (compare 1 Kings xii. 28; *Philo*, i. 371, ed. Mang.). Religious festivals, and especially those of the heathens, were celebrated with dances and public meals (see Judg. xxi. 21; 1 Sam. xviii. 6, 7; 2 Sam. vi. 5; 1 Kings xviii. 26).

7—14. קשה ערף, stiff-necked, obstinate, here persisting in the Egyptian abominations in spite of God's great

וְהִנֵּה עַם־קְשֵׁה־עֹרֶף הוּא׃ 10 וְעַתָּה הַנִּיחָה לִּי וְיִחַר־אַפִּי
בָהֶם וַאֲכַלֵּם וְאֶעֱשֶׂה אוֹתְךָ לְגוֹי גָּדוֹל׃ 11 וַיְחַל מֹשֶׁה אֶת־פְּנֵי
יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו וַיֹּאמֶר לָמָה יְהוָה יֶחֱרֶה אַפְּךָ בְּעַמֶּךָ אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתָ
מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם בְּכֹחַ גָּדוֹל וּבְיָד חֲזָקָה׃ 12 לָמָּה יֹאמְרוּ מִצְרַיִם
לֵאמֹר בְּרָעָה הוֹצִיאָם לַהֲרֹג אֹתָם בֶּהָרִים וּלְכַלֹּתָם מֵעַל פְּנֵי
הָאֲדָמָה שׁוּב מֵחֲרוֹן אַפֶּךָ וְהִנָּחֵם עַל־הָרָעָה לְעַמֶּךָ׃ 13 זְכֹר
לְאַבְרָהָם לְיִצְחָק וּלְיִשְׂרָאֵל עֲבָדֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתָּ לָהֶם בָּךְ
וַתְּדַבֵּר אֲלֵהֶם אַרְבֶּה אֶת־זַרְעֲכֶם כְּכוֹכְבֵי הַשָּׁמָיִם וְכָל־הָאָרֶץ
הַזֹּאת אֲשֶׁר אָמַרְתִּי אֶתֵּן לְזַרְעֲכֶם וְנָחֲלוּ לְעֹלָם׃ 14 וַיִּנָּחֶם יְהוָה
עַל־הָרָעָה אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר לַעֲשׂוֹת לְעַמּוֹ׃ פ
15 וַיִּפֶן וַיֵּרֶד מֹשֶׁה מִן־הָהָר וּשְׁנֵי לֻחֹת הָעֵדֻת בְּיָדוֹ לֻחֹת כְּתֻבִים
מִשְּׁנֵי עֶבְרֵיהֶם מִזֶּה וּמִזֶּה הֵם כְּתֻבִים׃ 16 וְהַלֻּחֹת מַעֲשֵׂה
אֱלֹהִים הֵמָּה וְהַמִּכְתָּב מִכְתַּב אֱלֹהִים הוּא חָרוּת עַל־הַלֻּחֹת׃
17 וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת־קוֹל הָעָם בְּרֵעֹה וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־מֹשֶׁה קוֹל
מִלְחָמָה בַּמַּחֲנֶה׃ 18 וַיֹּאמֶר אֵין קוֹל עֲנוֹת גְּבוּרָה וְאֵין קוֹל עֲנוֹת
חֲלוּשָׁה קוֹל עַנּוֹת אָנֹכִי שֹׁמֵעַ׃ 19 וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר קָרַב אֶל־הַמַּחֲנֶה

ס ברעו קרי

miracles. God foresaw that Moses would pray for the people (ver. 10); He tried him, therefore, whether he would prefer his personal glory to that of the people; but Moses implores God to fulfil His former promises, and to save Israel, from the three reasons stated in the twelfth and thirteenth verses.

15—20. Joshua, as the faithful and constant minister of Moses (נער xxxiii. 11), had accompanied him, and stayed at some lower part of the mountain, where he awaited his return (see note on xxv. 1).—בְּרֵעֹה instead of בְּרֵעוֹ, which is in the Keri, as in xxii. 4 בְּעִירֹה instead of בְּעִירוֹ; see the note there.—The words אין קול ענות וכו׳ contain a paronomasy with the words עֲנוֹת and עַנּוֹת, such as are not unfrequent in the Biblical books (see Isai. v. 7: משפט and משפח; צדקה and צעקה; etc.); and the sense is: I hear no clamour of those who conquer, nor of those who are conquered, but the voice of singing and shouting.—Moses, in his indignation, takes the calf, melts it in fire, to destroy first its shape; then grinds, or beats, or files the gold into small pieces, or dust, and throws the latter into the water of the river which comes from the Horeb (Deut. ix. 21). This is the only possible explanation which the literal sense of the text admits; שרף is not necessarily to consume by fire, but only to burn, to put into the flames, just as the kindred word בער is, in ii. 2, 3, used in both significations; the words טחן and דק, do not compel us to suppose the pieces to have been exactly so fine as powder; and as

said to Moses, I have seen this people, and, behold, it is a stiff-necked people. 10. Now, therefore, let me act, that my anger be kindled against them, and that I may annihilate them, and I will make of thee a great nation. 11. And Moses invoked the Lord his God, and said, Lord, why is Thy anger kindled against Thy people, which Thou hast brought from the land of Egypt with great power, and with a mighty hand? 12. Wherefore should the Egyptians speak and say, To *their* misfortune He brought them out to slay them in the mountains, and to annihilate them from the face of the earth? Turn from the rage of Thy anger, and recall the evil against Thy people. 13. Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, Thy servants, to whom Thou hast sworn by Thy own self, and to whom Thou hast said, I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven, and all this land of which I have spoken will I give to your seed, and they shall inherit *it* for ever. 14. And the Lord recalled the evil which He thought to do to His people.—15. And Moses turned and descended from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony *were* in his hand; the tables *were* written on both their sides, on the one side and on the other *were* they written. 16. And the tables *were* the work of God, and the writing *was* the writing of God, graven upon the tables. 17. And when Joshua heard the noise of the people as they shouted, he said to Moses, *there is* a noise of war in the camp. 18. And he said, *It is* not the voice of *those who* cry victory, nor the voice of *those who* cry defeat; the voice of *those who* sing do I hear. 19. And it happened when he approached the camp, that he saw the calf and the dancing, and the anger of Moses was kindled, and he cast

the act of drinking the water was a symbolical one, it would be pedantic to urge that the atoms which are thus produced are not small enough to amalgamate with the water. It is, therefore, neither necessary to recur with Rosenmüller to the conjecture, that the calf was, by a certain chemical process, known already to the ancient Egyptians, reduced to powder or *calcined*, nor to suppose here with Winer, "the incorrect view, or at least the incorrect expressions of a writer not versed in the matter." Moses threw the atoms into the water, as an emblem of the perfect annihilation of the calf, and he gave the Israelites that water to drink, not only to impress upon them the abomination and despicable character

וַיַּרְא אֶת־הָעֵגֶל וּמְחֹלֹת וַיִּחַר־אַף מֹשֶׁה וַיַּשְׁלֵךְ מִיָּדָו אֶת־הַלֻּחֹת
וַיְשַׁבֵּר אֹתָם תַּחַת הָהָר׃ 20 וַיִּקַּח אֶת־הָעֵגֶל אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ וַיִּשְׂרֹף בָּאֵשׁ
וַיִּטְחַן עַד אֲשֶׁר־דָּק וַיִּזֶר עַל־פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם וַיַּשְׁק אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃
21 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־אַהֲרֹן מֶה־עָשָׂה לְךָ הָעָם הַזֶּה כִּי־הֵבֵאתָ
עָלָיו חֲטָאָה גְדֹלָה׃ 22 וַיֹּאמֶר אַהֲרֹן אַל־יִחַר אַף אֲדֹנִי אַתָּה
יָדַעְתָּ אֶת־הָעָם כִּי בְרָע הוּא׃ 23 וַיֹּאמְרוּ לִי עֲשֵׂה־לָנוּ אֱלֹהִים
אֲשֶׁר יֵלְכוּ לְפָנֵינוּ כִּי־זֶה ׀ מֹשֶׁה הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱלָנוּ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם
לֹא יָדַעְנוּ מֶה־הָיָה לוֹ׃ 24 וָאֹמַר לָהֶם לְמִי זָהָב הִתְפָּרָקוּ וַיִּתְּנוּ־לִי
וָאַשְׁלִכֵהוּ בָאֵשׁ וַיֵּצֵא הָעֵגֶל הַזֶּה׃ 25 וַיַּרְא מֹשֶׁה אֶת־הָעָם כִּי פָרֻעַ
הוּא כִּי־פְרָעֹה אַהֲרֹן לְשִׁמְצָה בְּקָמֵיהֶם׃ 26 וַיַּעֲמֹד מֹשֶׁה בְּשַׁעַר
הַמַּחֲנֶה וַיֹּאמֶר מִי לַיהוָה אֵלָי וַיֵּאָסְפוּ אֵלָיו כָּל־בְּנֵי לֵוִי׃
27 וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שִׂימוּ אִישׁ־חַרְבּוֹ
עַל־יְרֵכוֹ עִבְרוּ וָשׁוּבוּ מִשַּׁעַר לָשַׁעַר בַּמַּחֲנֶה וְהִרְגוּ אִישׁ־אֶת־
אָחִיו וְאִישׁ אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ וְאִישׁ אֶת־קְרֹבוֹ׃ 28 וַיַּעֲשׂוּ בְנֵי־לֵוִי כִּדְבַר
מֹשֶׁה וַיִּפֹּל מִן־הָעָם בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא כִּשְׁלֹשֶׁת אַלְפֵי אִישׁ׃ 29 וַיֹּאמֶר
מֹשֶׁה מִלְאוּ יֶדְכֶם הַיּוֹם לַיהוָה כִּי אִישׁ בִּבְנוֹ וּבְאָחִיו וְלָתֵת עֲלֵיכֶם
הַיּוֹם בְּרָכָה׃ 30 וַיְהִי מִמָּחֳרָת וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־הָעָם אַתֶּם
חֲטָאתֶם חֲטָאָה גְדֹלָה וְעַתָּה אֶעֱלֶה אֶל־יְהוָה אוּלַי אֲכַפְּרָה
בְּעַד חַטַּאתְכֶם׃ 31 וַיָּשָׁב מֹשֶׁה אֶל־יְהוָה וַיֹּאמַר אָנָּא חָטָא הָעָם

ס מידיו קרי

of the image which they had made, but as a symbol of purification, to remove the object of the transgression by those very persons who had committed it (compare Num. xix.).

21—24. Aaron's reply to the reproachful question of Moses is designedly obscure and confused, because he was himself conscious of the great crime which his fatal want of moral courage had abetted.

25—29. Moses felt deeply the ignominy which Israel's revolt must necessarily call upon them in the eyes of their enemies (שמצה בקמיהם); and in order openly to show how much he abhorred their perverse conduct, he summoned the members of his tribe to kill the criminals with the sword, and not even to spare their nearest relatives from ill-placed compassion (see p. 345; and notes on xiii. 2, and xxii. 19). The Levites obeyed; and this first act of their ready zeal in the service of the Lord, was their initiation in their holy mission (מלאו ידכם; xxix. 9, etc.), and the source of all their future blessings (ver. 29).

the tables out of his hands and broke them at the foot of the mountain. 20. And he took the calf which they had made, and burnt *it* in fire, and ground *it* to powder, and scattered *it* on the surface of the water, and made the children of Israel drink of *it.* 21. And Moses said to Aaron, what hath this people done to thee, that thou hast brought *so* great a sin upon it? 22. And Aaron said, Let not the anger of my Lord be kindled; thou knowest the people, that it *is inclined* to evil. 23. And they said to me, make us[1] a god, who shall go before us, for *as for* this Moses, the man who hath brought us out of the land of Egypt, we do not know what hath become of him. 24. And I said to them, Whosoever hath gold, let him take *it* off; so they gave *it* me, and I cast it into the fire; and so this calf was produced. 25. And when Moses saw that the people [2]*was* unbridled; for Aaron had made it unbridled to an ignominy for their adversaries: 26. Then Moses stood in the gate of the camp, and said, He who *is* for the Lord, *may come* to me; and all the sons of Levi assembled to him. 27. And he said to them, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Put every man his sword at his side, pass on, and return from gate to gate in the camp, and slay every man his brother, and every man his friend, and every man his neighbour. 28. And the sons of Levi did according to the word of Moses, and there fell of the people on that day about three thousand men. 29. For Moses had said, Consecrate yourselves to-day to the Lord, yea, every man with his son, and with his brother, and bring upon yourselves a blessing to-day. 30. And it came to pass on the following morning, that Moses said to the people, You have sinned a great sin, and now I will ascend to the Lord, perhaps I shall make an atonement for your sin. 31. And Moses returned to the Lord, and said, Oh, this people hath sinned a great sin, and they

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Gods. [2] Were naked.

30—35. *If thou wilt forgive their sin* —it will be an act of unmerited mercy; this is an ellipsis on an aposiopesis, not unusual in the Oriental style; compare Gen. iv. 8, especially 1 Sam. xii. 14. But perhaps אם is here a particle of wishing:

הַזֶּה חֲטָאָה גְדֹלָה וַיַּעֲשׂוּ לָהֶם אֱלֹהֵי זָהָב׃ 32 וְעַתָּה אִם־תִּשָּׂא
חַטָּאתָם וְאִם־אַיִן מְחֵנִי נָא מִסִּפְרְךָ אֲשֶׁר כָּתָבְתָּ׃ 33 וַיֹּאמֶר
יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה מִי אֲשֶׁר חָטָא־לִי אֶמְחֶנּוּ מִסִּפְרִי׃ 34 וְעַתָּה לֵךְ ׀
נְחֵה אֶת־הָעָם אֶל אֲשֶׁר־דִּבַּרְתִּי לָךְ הִנֵּה מַלְאָכִי יֵלֵךְ לְפָנֶיךָ וּבְיוֹם
פָּקְדִי וּפָקַדְתִּי עֲלֵהֶם חַטָּאתָם׃ 35 וַיִּגֹּף יְהוָה אֶת־הָעָם עַל אֲשֶׁר
עָשׂוּ אֶת־הָעֵגֶל אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה אַהֲרֹן׃ ס

Oh, pardon their sin!—*Blot me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book which Thou hast written;* that is, take me from among the living; for in the public registers the names of all citizens are entered, but are erased when the individuals die; and this idea is here transferred to God, who is the ruler of mankind; compare Psalms lxix. 29; Isaiah. iv. 3.—About the *messenger* (מלאכי), see note on xxiii. 21.—*In the day when I visit, I will visit their sin upon them,* that is, I shall not leave them unpunished; and the plague which ensued must be considered as a chastise-

לג 1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵךְ עֲלֵה מִזֶּה אַתָּה וְהָעָם אֲשֶׁר
הֶעֱלִיתָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לְאַבְרָהָם לְיִצְחָק
וּלְיַעֲקֹב לֵאמֹר לְזַרְעֲךָ אֶתְּנֶנָּה׃ 2 וְשָׁלַחְתִּי לְפָנֶיךָ מַלְאָךְ וְגֵרַשְׁתִּי
אֶת־הַכְּנַעֲנִי הָאֱמֹרִי וְהַחִתִּי וְהַפְּרִזִּי הַחִוִּי וְהַיְבוּסִי׃ 3 אֶל־אֶרֶץ
זָבַת חָלָב וּדְבָשׁ כִּי לֹא אֶעֱלֶה בְּקִרְבְּךָ כִּי עַם־קְשֵׁה־עֹרֶף אַתָּה
פֶּן־אֲכֶלְךָ בַּדָּרֶךְ׃ 4 וַיִּשְׁמַע הָעָם אֶת־הַדָּבָר הָרָע הַזֶּה וַיִּתְאַבָּלוּ
וְלֹא־שָׁתוּ אִישׁ עֶדְיוֹ עָלָיו׃ 5 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה אֱמֹר
אֶל־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אַתֶּם עַם־קְשֵׁה־עֹרֶף רֶגַע אֶחָד אֶעֱלֶה בְקִרְבְּךָ
וְכִלִּיתִיךָ וְעַתָּה הוֹרֵד עֶדְיְךָ מֵעָלֶיךָ וְאֵדְעָה מָה אֶעֱשֶׂה־לָּךְ׃
6 וַיִּתְנַצְּלוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־עֶדְיָם מֵהַר חוֹרֵב׃ 7 וּמֹשֶׁה יִקַּח

1—6. God renews His assurance that He would lead Israel, through a messenger, into the Holy Land, and expel the Canaanites (xxiii. 20—23). But He urges here, more distinctly than He had done before, that He would not lead them Himself, because they had now too openly manifested their disobedience and obstinacy, a re-iteration of which would, if God were personally present among them, cause their ruin and extirpation. The people felt at last contrition, put off their ornaments, and repented in mourning their unpardonable levity (ver. 4). God saw their self-humiliation, exhorted them to persevere in it, and promised them merciful consideration (ver. 5).—ויתנצלו מהר ··· חרב, is a *constructio praegnans*, and must be understood: they laid off their ornaments, *returning to their*

have made to themselves a god of gold. 32. And now, if Thou wilt forgive their sin—; but if not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book which Thou hast written. 33. And the Lord said to Moses, Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book. 34. Therefore now go, lead the people to *the place* of which I have spoken to thee: behold, my [1]messenger shall go before thee: and in the day when I visit I shall visit their sin upon them. 35. And the Lord plagued the people, because they made the calf which Aaron had made.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Angel.

ment for their sin, which was thereby expiated. These words cannot mean: whenever they, *or their descendants*, will sin, I shall always punish them in some degree for that transgression also; for this would be in opposition with the promise of God, that He will only punish those who have sinned (ver. 33).

Chap. XXXIII. 1. And the Lord said to Moses, Go, journey up hence, thou and the people which thou hast brought out of the land of Egypt, to the land which I have sworn to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, saying, To thy seed will I give it. 2. And I will send[1] a messenger before thee; and I will drive out the Canaanite, the Amorite, and the Hittite, and the Perizzite, the Hivite, and the Jebusite: 3. To a land flowing with milk and honey; for I will not go up in the midst of thee; for thou art a stiff-necked people, lest I consume thee on the way. 4. And when the people heard these evil words, they mourned, and no man put on his ornaments. 5. [2]And the Lord said to Moses, Say to the children of Israel, you *are* a stiff-necked people; [3]if I go up in the midst of thee *but* one moment, I should destroy thee; therefore now lay off thy ornaments from thee, that I may know what I shall do to thee. 6. And the children of Israel divested themselves of their ornaments [4]*returning* from the Mount Horeb. 7. And Moses took the [5]tent and pitched *it* for

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—An angel. [2] For the Lord had said. [3] I will come up in the midst of thee in a moment. [4] By the Mount Horeb. [5] Tabernacle.

camps from Mount Horeb; see note on ix. 29.

7—11. The Israelites had revolted against God; they were unworthy of His

אֶת־הָאֹהֶל וְנָטָה־לוֹ ׀ מִחוּץ לַֽמַּחֲנֶה הַרְחֵק מִן־הַֽמַּחֲנֶה וְקָרָא
לוֹ אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וְהָיָה כָּל־מְבַקֵּשׁ יְהוָה יֵצֵא אֶל־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד אֲשֶׁר
מִחוּץ לַֽמַּחֲנֶה׃ 8 וְהָיָה כְּצֵאת מֹשֶׁה אֶל־הָאֹהֶל יָקוּמוּ כָּל־הָעָם
וְנִצְּבוּ אִישׁ פֶּתַח אָהֳלוֹ וְהִבִּיטוּ אַחֲרֵי מֹשֶׁה עַד־בֹּאוֹ הָאֹֽהֱלָה׃
9 וְהָיָה כְּבֹא מֹשֶׁה הָאֹהֱלָה יֵרֵד עַמּוּד הֶעָנָן וְעָמַד פֶּתַח הָאֹהֶל
וְדִבֶּר עִם־מֹשֶׁה׃ 10 וְרָאָה כָל־הָעָם אֶת־עַמּוּד הֶעָנָן עֹמֵד פֶּתַח
הָאֹהֶל וְקָם כָּל־הָעָם וְהִֽשְׁתַּחֲווּ אִישׁ פֶּתַח אָהֳלוֹ׃ 11 וְדִבֶּר
יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה פָּנִים אֶל־פָּנִים כַּאֲשֶׁר יְדַבֵּר אִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ
וְשָׁב אֶל־הַֽמַּחֲנֶה וּמְשָׁרְתוֹ יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בִּן־נוּן נַעַר לֹא יָמִישׁ מִתּוֹךְ
הָאֹֽהֶל׃ פ שלישי
12 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־יְהוָה רְאֵה אַתָּה אֹמֵר אֵלַי הַעַל אֶת־הָעָם
הַזֶּה וְאַתָּה לֹא הוֹדַעְתַּנִי אֵת אֲשֶׁר־תִּשְׁלַח עִמִּי וְאַתָּה אָמַרְתָּ
יְדַעְתִּיךָ בְשֵׁם וְגַם־מָצָאתָ חֵן בְּעֵינָי׃ 13 וְעַתָּה אִם־נָא מָצָאתִי
חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ הוֹדִעֵנִי נָא אֶת־דְּרָכֶךָ וְאֵדָעֲךָ לְמַעַן אֶמְצָא־חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ
וּרְאֵה כִּי עַמְּךָ הַגּוֹי הַזֶּה׃ 14 וַיֹּאמַר פָּנַי יֵלֵכוּ וַהֲנִחֹתִי לָךְ׃
15 וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו אִם־אֵין פָּנֶיךָ הֹלְכִים אַל־תַּעֲלֵנוּ מִזֶּה׃ 16 וּבַמֶּה ׀
יִוָּדַע אֵפוֹא כִּֽי־מָצָאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ אֲנִי וְעַמֶּךָ הֲלוֹא בְּלֶכְתְּךָ עִמָּנוּ
וְנִפְלֵינוּ אֲנִי וְעַמְּךָ מִכָּל־הָעָם אֲשֶׁר עַל־פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה׃ פ רביעי

presence; Moses alone had remained faithful, and as the Lord wished to continue His communions with the latter, He ordered him to place his tent without the camp; here He appeared to Moses, and it could, therefore, justly be called a "Tent of Meeting" (ver. 7; compare xviii. 7). The glory of God, which accompanied these communications, contributed to enhance the authority of Moses, whom the people now regarded not only with respect, but with reverence. It was only after a perfect conciliation between God and Israel, that the latter were allowed to encamp round the Sanctuary (Numb. ii). It is therefore obvious, that this "Tent of Meeting" is neither the Tabernacle, the erection of which is only described in the last chapter of this book, nor, as some ancient commentators proposed, a certain portable sacred tent which the Israelites possessed as an inheritance from the time of the patriarchs.—God spoke to Moses *face to face*, that is, according to Numb. xii. 8, not in obscure visions, not in enigmatical allusions, but in distinct words and expressions, "as a man speaketh to his friend." However, it is more than once repeated, that although Moses heard a voice, he saw no manner of similitude (Deut. iv. 15, etc.); so careful is the sacred word in avoiding

himself without the camp, and called it [1]the Tent of Meeting. And it came to pass, *that* every one who sought the Lord went out to the Tent of Meeting, which *was* without the camp. 8. And it came to pass, when Moses went to the tent, *that* all the people rose, and stood every man *at* the door of his tent, and looked after Moses, until he was gone into the tent. 9. And it came to pass when Moses entered into the tent, *that* the pillar of cloud descended, and stood *at* the door of the tent; and *the Lord* spoke with Moses. 10. And all the people saw the pillar of cloud standing *at* the door of the tent; and all the people rose, and bowed down, every man *at* the door of his tent. 11. And the Lord spoke to Moses face to face, as a man speaketh to his friend. And he returned to the camp; but his servant Joshua, the son of Nun, the minister, did not depart out of the tent. 12. And Moses said to the Lord, See, Thou sayest to me, Lead this people; and Thou hast not let me know, whom Thou wilt send with me; yet Thou hast said, I know thee by name, and thou hast also found grace in my sight. 13. Now, therefore, I pray Thee, if I have found grace in Thy eyes, show me, I pray, Thy way, that I may know Thee; that I may find grace in Thy eyes: and see that this nation *is* Thy people. 14. And He said, My presence shall go *with thee*, and I will lead thee to rest. 15. And he said to Him, If Thy presence does not go *with me*, let us not go from here. 16. And how shall it in fact be known that I and Thy people have found grace in Thy eyes? *is it* not by Thy going with us? [2]and if we are distinguished, I and Thy people, from all the nations which *are* on the face of

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Tabernacle of the congregation. [2] So shall we be separated.

terms which might lead to erroneous conceptions on the nature of the Deity.

12—23. Moses despairs of the possibility of leading alone the obstinate and vacillating people into the promised land, although God had assured him: "I know thee by name," that is, I have selected thee among all thy people, and appointed thee as their leader (ver. 12). He implores God's immediate and personal assistance; he desires to know "His ways, that he might know Him," that is, he wishes to be informed of all His attributes, that he might better be enabled to act according to His will and delight (ver. 13). And God promises to guide

17 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה גַּם אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ
אֶעֱשֶׂה כִּי־מָצָאתָ חֵן בְּעֵינַי וָאֵדָעֲךָ בְּשֵׁם׃ 18 וַיֹּאמַר הַרְאֵנִי נָא
אֶת־כְּבֹדֶךָ׃ 19 וַיֹּאמֶר אֲנִי אַעֲבִיר כָּל־טוּבִי עַל־פָּנֶיךָ וְקָרָאתִי
בְשֵׁם יְהוָה לְפָנֶיךָ וְחַנֹּתִי אֶת־אֲשֶׁר אָחֹן וְרִחַמְתִּי אֶת־אֲשֶׁר אֲרַחֵם׃
20 וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא תוּכַל לִרְאֹת אֶת־פָּנָי כִּי לֹא־יִרְאַנִי הָאָדָם וָחָי׃
21 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה הִנֵּה מָקוֹם אִתִּי וְנִצַּבְתָּ עַל־הַצּוּר׃ 22 וְהָיָה
בַּעֲבֹר כְּבֹדִי וְשַׂמְתִּיךָ בְּנִקְרַת הַצּוּר וְשַׂכֹּתִי כַפִּי עָלֶיךָ עַד־
עָבְרִי׃ 23 וַהֲסִרֹתִי אֶת־כַּפִּי וְרָאִיתָ אֶת־אֲחֹרָי וּפָנַי לֹא
יֵרָאוּ׃ פ חמישי

(כבוד) of God, or with His eternal qualities (ver. 18); God yields to this request likewise, and promises to reveal to him all His "goodness," or all His attributes of love and mercy; from which he will be able to infer who deserves forgiveness and compassion (ver. 19; see xxxiv. 5, 6). "I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee," implies that God will teach him those attributes in so unmistakeable a manner that he will know that the revelation proceeds from Him. However, although Moses might be able to understand the nature of God, with his intellect, no living man can behold Him with his external senses (ver. 20). If the contents of this whole section are obscure, this mysteriousness attains its

him, and to accompany Israel; "my presence shall go" (פני ילכו). That פנים is sometimes used merely as a personal pronoun, has been observed in p. 506 (compare 2 Sam. xvii. 11); according to Maimonides (Mor. Neb. i. 64), פנים expresses God in His external manifestations; כבוד (vers. 18, 22), in His internal essence. Without the protection of God, Moses resigns every further advance in their journeys; for it is by His Divine nearness alone that Israel is distinguished from all the nations of the earth (ונפלינו, compare xix. 5, 6). God grants him this request so fervently urged (ver. 17); Moses, encouraged by this concession, renews, with greater force, his former wish to be acquainted with the "glory"

לד 1 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה פְּסָל־לְךָ שְׁנֵי־לֻחֹת אֲבָנִים כָּרִאשֹׁנִים
וְכָתַבְתִּי עַל־הַלֻּחֹת אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ עַל־הַלֻּחֹת הָרִאשֹׁנִים
אֲשֶׁר שִׁבַּרְתָּ׃ 2 וֶהְיֵה נָכוֹן לַבֹּקֶר וְעָלִיתָ בַבֹּקֶר אֶל־הַר סִינַי
וְנִצַּבְתָּ לִי שָׁם עַל־רֹאשׁ הָהָר׃ 3 וְאִישׁ לֹא־יַעֲלֶה עִמָּךְ וְגַם־אִישׁ

1—3. The covenant between Israel shall be renewed; the basis of this covenant are the Ten Commandments; they are the דברי הברית; Moses is, therefore, ordered to make two other tables of stone (whilst the first had been made by God Himself); and to appear alone, without being accompanied by any one, on the *top* of Mount Sinai. Thus this second revelation took place in still more

the earth? 17. And the Lord said to Moses, I shall do the thing *of* which thou hast spoken; for thou hast found grace in my eyes, and I know thee by name. 18. And he said, I pray Thee, show me Thy glory. 19. And He said, I shall make all my goodness pass before thee, and I shall proclaim the name of the Lord before thee, and shall be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and shall show mercy on whom I will show mercy. 20. And He said, Thou canst not see my face; for no man can see me and live. 21. And the Lord said, Behold, *there is* a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon the rock. 22. And it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a clift of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by. 23. And then I will take away my hand, and thou shalt see my back; but my face cannot be seen.

highest climax in the three last verses (21—23). The text describes one of those familiar communions between God and Moses; the latter desires to know what no human being can fathom, what no human language can express; in speaking of the sublimest metaphysical truths it would be requisite to employ a purely metaphysical medium of expression; when they are discussed in the ordinary language of man, their aerial essence assumes unavoidably a gross garment; and it is obligatory on the reflective mind of the reader to divest them again of this matter, and to conceive them in their pure abstraction. We observe here, therefore, only, that the Divine appearance was behind covered by a cloud, and that Moses was therefore allowed to see it; but the shining glory of His face he was not permitted to behold. The last verse may, indeed, contain that profound idea which ancient interpreters deduced from it, that man may see the *works* of God or the *consequences* of His activity (אחרי), but that he cannot penetrate into their internal principles, their motives and their ends (פני).

CHAP. XXXIV. 1. And the Lord said to Moses, Hew thee two tables of stone like the first: and I will write upon *these* tables the words which were on the first tables, which thou hast broken. 2. And be ready in the morning, and ascend in the morning to mount Sinai, and present thyself there to me on the top of the mount. 3. And no man shall ascend with thee, nor let any man be seen

solemn solitude than the former one (compare xxiv. 9; xix. 17). Moses executed these commands; according to tradition, he ascended the mountain on the first day of Ellul, and returned on the tenth of Tishri, the Day of Atonement, on which he proclaimed the perfect pardon which God had granted to His people. The

אַל־יֵרָא בְּכָל־הָהָר גַּם־הַצֹּאן וְהַבָּקָר אַל־יִרְעוּ אֶל־מוּל הָהָר הַהוּא׃
4 וַיִּפְסֹל שְׁנֵי־לֻחֹת אֲבָנִים כָּרִאשֹׁנִים וַיַּשְׁכֵּם מֹשֶׁה בַבֹּקֶר וַיַּעַל
אֶל־הַר סִינַי כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֹתוֹ וַיִּקַּח בְּיָדוֹ שְׁנֵי לֻחֹת אֲבָנִים׃
5 וַיֵּרֶד יְהוָה בֶּעָנָן וַיִּתְיַצֵּב עִמּוֹ שָׁם וַיִּקְרָא בְשֵׁם יְהוָה׃ 6 וַיַּעֲבֹר
יְהוָה ׀ עַל־פָּנָיו וַיִּקְרָא יְהוָה ׀ יְהוָה אֵל רַחוּם וְחַנּוּן אֶרֶךְ אַפַּיִם
וְרַב־חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת׃ 7 נֹצֵר חֶסֶד לָאֲלָפִים נֹשֵׂא עָוֹן וָפֶשַׁע וְחַטָּאָה
וְנַקֵּה לֹא יְנַקֶּה פֹּקֵד ׀ עֲוֹן אָבוֹת עַל־בָּנִים וְעַל־בְּנֵי בָנִים עַל־שִׁלֵּשִׁים
וְעַל־רִבֵּעִים׃ 8 וַיְמַהֵר מֹשֶׁה וַיִּקֹּד אַרְצָה וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ׃ 9 וַיֹּאמֶר
אִם־נָא מָצָאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ אֲדֹנָי יֵלֶךְ־נָא אֲדֹנָי בְּקִרְבֵּנוּ כִּי עַם־
קְשֵׁה־עֹרֶף הוּא וְסָלַחְתָּ לַעֲוֹנֵנוּ וּלְחַטָּאתֵנוּ וּנְחַלְתָּנוּ׃ ששי
10 וַיֹּאמֶר הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי כֹּרֵת בְּרִית נֶגֶד כָּל־עַמְּךָ אֶעֱשֶׂה נִפְלָאֹת
אֲשֶׁר לֹא־נִבְרְאוּ בְכָל־הָאָרֶץ וּבְכָל־הַגּוֹיִם וְרָאָה כָל־הָעָם אֲשֶׁר־
אַתָּה בְקִרְבּוֹ אֶת־מַעֲשֵׂה יְהוָה כִּי־נוֹרָא הוּא אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה
עִמָּךְ׃ 11 שְׁמָר־לְךָ אֵת אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי מְצַוְּךָ הַיּוֹם הִנְנִי גֹרֵשׁ
מִפָּנֶיךָ אֶת־הָאֱמֹרִי וְהַכְּנַעֲנִי וְהַחִתִּי וְהַפְּרִזִּי וְהַחִוִּי וְהַיְבוּסִי׃
12 הִשָּׁמֶר לְךָ פֶּן־תִּכְרֹת בְּרִית לְיוֹשֵׁב הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה בָּא
עָלֶיהָ פֶּן־יִהְיֶה לְמוֹקֵשׁ בְּקִרְבֶּךָ׃ 13 כִּי אֶת־מִזְבְּחֹתָם תִּתֹּצוּן וְאֶת־
מַצֵּבֹתָם תְּשַׁבֵּרוּן וְאֶת־אֲשֵׁרָיו תִּכְרֹתוּן׃ 14 כִּי לֹא תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה

ס מן רבתי

Lord fulfilled the promise made to Moses in xxxiii. 19; He proclaimed His name (ver. 5); passed by before Moses, and pronounced His attributes of kindness and mercy. These momentous and sublime epithets might be made the basis of a complete theology of the Old Testament; they deserve, indeed, a systematic treatment, which must, however, be reserved to another more appropriate place. —"The Eternal is the Eternal" (יי׳ יי׳) forms the corner-stone of the Divine attributes; He is unchangeable; His mercy once promised, will for ever be manifest and abundant; the sin of the golden calf has not altered His former decree to love and to guide Israel as His own people (compare iii. 14; *Talm.*, Rosh. Hash. 17 *b*). On the contents of ver. 7, see our explanation of the second commandment (compare Num. xiv. 18; Psalms ciii. 8). The Rabbins count thirteen attributes (שלש עשרה מדות), taking ונקה as one separate quality; and they have most suitably appointed them as a kind of refrain for all prayers of repentance and atonement.

9—26. Moses is overwhelmed by the

throughout all the mount; nor let the flocks and herds feed before that mount. 4. And he hewed two tables of stone like the first; and Moses rose up early in the morning, and ascended to mount Sinai, as the Lord had commanded him, and took in his hand the two tables of stone. 5. And the Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with him there, and proclaimed the name of the Lord. 6. And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Eternal, the Eternal, a God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth; 7. Keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, but who will by no means always leave unpunished; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, to the third and to the fourth *generation.* 8. And Moses hastened, and bowed to the earth, and prostrated himself.—9. And he said, If now I have found grace in Thy sight, O Lord, let my Lord, I pray Thee, go among us; [1]although it *is* a stiff-necked people; and pardon our iniquity and our sin, and take us for Thy inheritance. 10. And He said, Behold, I make a covenant: before all thy people I will do marvels, such as have not been done in all the earth, nor in any nation: and all the people among which thou *art* shall see the work of the Lord: for it *is* a terrible thing which I will do with thee. 11. Observe thou that which I command thee this day: behold, I drive out before thee the Amorite, and the Canaanite, and the Hittite, and the Perizzite, and the Hivite, and the Jebusite. 12. Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, lest it be for a snare in the midst of thee: 13. But you shall destroy their altars, break their images, and [2]annihilate their Astartes. 14. For thou shalt worship no other god: for the Lord, [3]Zealous *is* His name, He

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—For. [2] Cut down their groves.
[3] Whose name is Jealous, etc.

power of these majestic titles (ver. 8); but as they all breathe love and compassion, he is induced to repeat his entreaty that God might go with Israel, and receive them as His people (ונחלתנו, see xxxiii. 16), *although* it is a refractory nation (ver. 9). כי in the meaning of "although," see xiii. 17.—God renews

לְאֵל אַחֵר כִּי יְהוָה קַנָּא שְׁמוֹ אֵל קַנָּא הוּא׃ 15 פֶּן־תִּכְרֹת בְּרִית
לְיוֹשֵׁב הָאָרֶץ וְזָנוּ ׀ אַחֲרֵי אֱלֹהֵיהֶם וְזָבְחוּ לֵאלֹהֵיהֶם וְקָרָא לְךָ
וְאָכַלְתָּ מִזִּבְחוֹ׃ 16 וְלָקַחְתָּ מִבְּנֹתָיו לְבָנֶיךָ וְזָנוּ בְנֹתָיו אַחֲרֵי
אֱלֹהֵיהֶן וְהִזְנוּ אֶת־בָּנֶיךָ אַחֲרֵי אֱלֹהֵיהֶן׃ 17 אֱלֹהֵי מַסֵּכָה לֹא
תַעֲשֶׂה־לָּךְ׃ 18 אֶת־חַג הַמַּצּוֹת תִּשְׁמֹר שִׁבְעַת יָמִים תֹּאכַל מַצּוֹת
אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִךָ לְמוֹעֵד חֹדֶשׁ הָאָבִיב כִּי בְּחֹדֶשׁ הָאָבִיב יָצָאתָ
מִמִּצְרָיִם׃ 19 כָּל־פֶּטֶר רֶחֶם לִי וְכָל־מִקְנְךָ תִּזָּכָר פֶּטֶר שׁוֹר וָשֶׂה׃
20 וּפֶטֶר חֲמוֹר תִּפְדֶּה בְשֶׂה וְאִם־לֹא תִפְדֶּה וַעֲרַפְתּוֹ כֹּל בְּכוֹר
בָּנֶיךָ תִּפְדֶּה וְלֹא־יֵרָאוּ פָנַי רֵיקָם׃ 21 שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲבֹד וּבַיּוֹם
הַשְּׁבִיעִי תִּשְׁבֹּת בֶּחָרִישׁ וּבַקָּצִיר תִּשְׁבֹּת׃ 22 וְחַג שָׁבֻעֹת תַּעֲשֶׂה
לְךָ בִּכּוּרֵי קְצִיר חִטִּים וְחַג הָאָסִיף תְּקוּפַת הַשָּׁנָה׃ 23 שָׁלֹשׁ
פְּעָמִים בַּשָּׁנָה יֵרָאֶה כָּל־זְכוּרְךָ אֶת־פְּנֵי הָאָדֹן ׀ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃
24 כִּי־אוֹרִישׁ גּוֹיִם מִפָּנֶיךָ וְהִרְחַבְתִּי אֶת־גְּבֻלֶךָ וְלֹא־יַחְמֹד אִישׁ
אֶת־אַרְצְךָ בַּעֲלֹתְךָ לֵרָאוֹת אֶת־פְּנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ שָׁלֹשׁ פְּעָמִים
בַּשָּׁנָה׃ 25 לֹא־תִשְׁחַט עַל־חָמֵץ דַּם־זִבְחִי וְלֹא־יָלִין לַבֹּקֶר זֶבַח
חַג הַפָּסַח׃ 26 רֵאשִׁית בִּכּוּרֵי אַדְמָתְךָ תָּבִיא בֵּית יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
לֹא־תְבַשֵּׁל גְּדִי בַּחֲלֵב אִמּוֹ׃ פ שביעי

ס ר׳ רבתי

at last unreservedly the former alliance with Israel, under precisely the same conditions as those specified in chapters xx—xxiii. He promises to do unparalleled miracles for Israel (ver. 10), and to expel the nations of Canaan (ver. 11), but the Israelites are commanded to abstain from every association with them (vers. 12, 15; compare xxiii. 32, 33); for since God and Israel have concluded, as it were, a matrimonial alliance (see p. 333), the adoration of heathen gods is faithlessness and treachery, and a breach of the sacred covenant: to destroy their altars, to break their images, and to annihilate their Astartes (ver. 13; compare xxiii. 24; אשרה is the image of the Astarte or Venus, worshipped by the Phœnicians and Aramæans; not "groves," which signification is perfectly unsupported; see *Gesen.* Thes. p. 162); to adore no other deity except God, who is zealous and severe (ver. 14; compare xx. 5); to make no molten gods (ver. 17; compare xx. 20); to observe the Passover (ver. 18; compare xxiii. 15); to sanctify to God every firstborn of man and beast (vers. 19, 20; compare xxxiii. 2, 13; before תזכר, Niph. of זכר, to be born a male, אשר is to be supplied, and מקנה is used as a feminine; Onk. and Sept. translate indistinctly); to keep the Sabbath even in

is a Zealous God: 15. Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land; *for* when they go astray after their gods, and sacrifice to their gods, they might invite thee, and thou wouldst eat of their sacrifice; 16. And thou wouldst take of their daughters to thy sons, and when their daughters go astray after their gods, they would make thy sons go astray after their gods. 17. Thou shalt make to thyself no molten gods. 18. The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep. Seven days thou shalt eat unleavened bread, as I commanded thee, in the time of the month Abib: for in the month Abib thou camest out of Egypt. 19. All that openeth the womb *is* mine; and all thy cattle *which* is born as male, the firstling of ox or of sheep. 20. But the firstling of an ass thou shalt redeem with a lamb: and if thou dost not redeem *it*, then shalt thou break its neck. All the firstborn of thy sons thou shalt redeem. And none shall appear before me empty. 21. Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest: in the time of ploughing and of reaping thou shalt rest. 22. And thou shalt observe the feast of weeks, of the firstfruits of wheat harvest, and the feast of ingathering *at* the year's circuit. 23. Thrice in the year shall all your males appear before the Lord God, the God of Israel. 24. For I shall expel the nations before thee, and enlarge thy boundaries: nor shall any man desire thy land, when thou goest up to appear before the Lord thy God thrice in the year. 25. Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven; nor shall the sacrifice of the Feast of the Passover be left to the morning. 26. The first of the firstfruits of thy land thou shalt bring to the house of the Lord thy God. Thou shalt

the time of ploughing and reaping (ver. 21; compare xxiii. 12); to celebrate Pentecost and the Feast of Tabernacles (vers. 22, 23; compare xxiii. 14, 16, 17), for God will during their pilgrimages to the temple shield the land and keep off the enemies (ver. 24); to remove all leaven previous to the sacrificing of the paschal-lamb, not to leave anything of it, or of its fat, to the following morning (ver. 25; compare xiii. 18; xii. 10); to offer to God all firstling-fruits, and not to seethe the kid in the milk of its mother (ver. 26; compare xxiii. 19).—It is necessary to remark, that all the laws here enjoined concern exclusively the relation between man and God, not between man and his fellow-man; for this was a renewal of

27 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה כְּתָב־לְךָ אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה כִּי עַל־
פִּי ׀ הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה כָּרַתִּי אִתְּךָ בְּרִית וְאֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ 28 וַיְהִי־
שָׁם עִם־יְהוָה אַרְבָּעִים יוֹם וְאַרְבָּעִים לַיְלָה לֶחֶם לֹא אָכַל
וּמַיִם לֹא שָׁתָה וַיִּכְתֹּב עַל־הַלֻּחֹת אֵת דִּבְרֵי הַבְּרִית עֲשֶׂרֶת הַדְּבָרִים׃
29 וַיְהִי בְּרֶדֶת מֹשֶׁה מֵהַר סִינַי וּשְׁנֵי לֻחֹת הָעֵדֻת בְּיַד־מֹשֶׁה בְּרִדְתּוֹ
מִן־הָהָר וּמֹשֶׁה לֹא־יָדַע כִּי קָרַן עוֹר פָּנָיו בְּדַבְּרוֹ אִתּוֹ׃ 30 וַיַּרְא
אַהֲרֹן וְכָל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־מֹשֶׁה וְהִנֵּה קָרַן עוֹר פָּנָיו וַיִּירְאוּ מִגֶּשֶׁת
אֵלָיו׃ 31 וַיִּקְרָא אֲלֵהֶם מֹשֶׁה וַיָּשֻׁבוּ אֵלָיו אַהֲרֹן וְכָל־הַנְּשִׂאִים בָּעֵדָה
וַיְדַבֵּר מֹשֶׁה אֲלֵהֶם׃ 32 וְאַחֲרֵי־כֵן נִגְּשׁוּ כָּל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְצַוֵּם
אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אִתּוֹ בְּהַר סִינָי׃ מפטיר 33 וַיְכַל מֹשֶׁה
מִדַּבֵּר אִתָּם וַיִּתֵּן עַל־פָּנָיו מַסְוֶה׃ 34 וּבְבֹא מֹשֶׁה לִפְנֵי יְהוָה
לְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ יָסִיר אֶת־הַמַּסְוֶה עַד־צֵאתוֹ וְיָצָא וְדִבֶּר אֶל־בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל אֵת אֲשֶׁר יְצֻוֶּה׃ 35 וְרָאוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־פְּנֵי מֹשֶׁה כִּי
קָרַן עוֹר פְּנֵי מֹשֶׁה וְהֵשִׁיב מֹשֶׁה אֶת־הַמַּסְוֶה עַל־פָּנָיו עַד־בֹּאוֹ
לְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ׃ ס

the covenant which had been broken, not by any neglect of human, but of divine duties.

27—35. Moses wrote down all these commands, whilst God Himself engraved the decalogue on the tables (compare ver. 1; Deut. x. 4). After forty days he descended; and his face shone from the reflex of the Divine glory, which had communed with him (ver. 29: קרן עור פניו; the verb קרן is synonymous with נגה, see Hab. iii. 4; the Vulg. translates *cornuata* facies; and hence it came, that Moses is frequently represented with horns!). Aaron and the people were afraid to approach him in such radiant splendour (ver. 30); but Moses encouraged them, called them to himself, and spoke to them (ver. 31). But when he was alone, he covered his face with a veil (מסוה, *κάλυμμα*), which he took off whenever God spoke to him, or whenever he addressed the people. The custom, therefore, of some Oriental princes, who

ס ס ס

לה 1 וַיַּקְהֵל מֹשֶׁה אֶת־כָּל־עֲדַת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם

CHAPTERS XXXV. TO XL.

Summary.—After having again enjoined the strict observance of the Sabbath (xxxv. 1—3), Moses invites the people to bring free-will gifts for the construction of the Tabernacle, and its vessels, and for the holy garments (ver. 4—20); the people respond so liberally to the call that Moses saw the necessity of restraining

not seethe a kid in its mother's milk.—27. And the Lord said to Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words [1]I make a covenant with thee and with Israel. 28. And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread nor drink water. And He wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the Ten Commandments.—29. And it came to pass, when Moses came down from mount Sinai with the two tables of testimony in Moses' hand, when he came down from the mount, that Moses knew not that the skin of his face shone; [2]since He had spoken to him. 30. And when Aaron and all the children of Israel saw Moses, behold the skin of his face shone: and they were afraid to approach him. 31. And Moses called them; and all the chiefs of the congregation returned to him: and Moses spoke with them. 32. And afterwards all the children of Israel approached: and he commanded them all that which the Lord had spoken with him in mount Sinai. 33. And [3]when Moses had finished speaking with them, he put a veil on his face. 34. But when Moses went before the Lord to speak with Him, he took the veil off, until He came out. And he came out, and spoke to the children of Israel *that* which he was commanded. 35. And the children of Israel saw the face of Moses, that the skin of Moses' face shone: and Moses put the veil upon his face again, until he went in to speak with Him.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—I have made. [2] While he talked with him.
[3] *Till* Moses had done speaking with them, etc.

wear a veil (*letham* or *kenaa*) *when they appear in public*, is in no way similar to this practice of Moses, who covered his face, evidently as a symbol of deep and undivided reflection, such as behoved him who had been deemed worthy to experience the awful splendour of the Almighty.

CHAP. XXXV. 1. And Moses assembled all the congregation of the children of Israel, and said to them,

their hearty generosity (xxxv. 1—7). Bezaleel, Aholiab, and all the skilful workmen began their work; they made the curtains with their loops and taches (ver. 8—19); the boards (ver. 20—30), and their bars (ver. 31—34); the vails before the Holy of Holies and before the Sanctuary, with their pillars (ver. 35—38).—Bezaleel then finished the ark and its staves (xxxvii. 1—5); the mercy-seat and the Cherubim (ver. 6—9); the table of shew-bread, with its

אֵלֶּה הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה יְהוָֹה לַעֲשֹׂת אֹתָם׃ 2 שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים
תֵּעָשֶׂה מְלָאכָה וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי יִהְיֶה לָכֶם קֹדֶשׁ שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן
לַיהוָֹה כָּל־הָעֹשֶׂה בוֹ מְלָאכָה יוּמָת׃ 3 לֹא־תְבַעֲרוּ אֵשׁ בְּכֹל
מֹשְׁבֹתֵיכֶם בְּיוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת׃ פ
4 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־כָּל־עֲדַת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל־לֵאמֹר זֶה הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר־
צִוָּה יְהוָֹה לֵאמֹר׃ 5 קְחוּ מֵאִתְּכֶם תְּרוּמָה לַיהוָֹה כֹּל נְדִיב לִבּוֹ
יְבִיאֶהָ אֵת תְּרוּמַת יְהוָֹה זָהָב וָכֶסֶף וּנְחֹשֶׁת׃ 6 וּתְכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן
וְתוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי וְשֵׁשׁ וְעִזִּים׃ 7 וְעֹרֹת אֵילִם מְאָדָּמִים וְעֹרֹת תְּחָשִׁים
וַעֲצֵי שִׁטִּים׃ 8 וְשֶׁמֶן לַמָּאוֹר וּבְשָׂמִים לְשֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה וְלִקְטֹרֶת
הַסַּמִּים׃ 9 וְאַבְנֵי־שֹׁהַם וְאַבְנֵי מִלֻּאִים לָאֵפוֹד וְלַחֹשֶׁן׃ 10 וְכָל־
חֲכַם־לֵב בָּכֶם יָבֹאוּ וְיַעֲשׂוּ אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָֹה׃ 11 אֶת־
הַמִּשְׁכָּן אֶת־אָהֳלוֹ וְאֶת־מִכְסֵהוּ אֶת־קְרָסָיו וְאֶת־קְרָשָׁיו אֶת־
בְּרִיחוֹ° אֶת־עַמֻּדָיו וְאֶת־אֲדָנָיו׃ 12 אֶת־הָאָרֹן וְאֶת־בַּדָּיו אֶת־
הַכַּפֹּרֶת וְאֵת פָּרֹכֶת הַמָּסָךְ׃ 13 אֶת־הַשֻּׁלְחָן וְאֶת־בַּדָּיו וְאֶת־

° בריחיו קרי

staves and vessels (vers. 10—16); the candlestick with its accessories (vers. 17—24); the altar of incense with its staves (vers. 25—28); and the anointing oil and the incense of perfumes (ver. 29).—He further made the altar of burnt-offering with its staves and vessels (xxxviii. 1—7); the laver and its base (ver. 8); the Court with its pillars and hangings (vers. 9—20). The text inserts the amount of gold, silver, and brass contributed and used for the Tabernacle (vers. 24—31). Lastly, the holy garments were made: the ephod, with its two onyxes, (xxxix. 1—7); the breast-plate with the twelve precious stones, its chains, sockets, and rings (vers. 8—21); the robe of the ephod, with the pomegranates and bells (vers. 22—26); the tunics (ver. 27); the mitre with the golden plate, the turbans (vers. 28, 30, 31); and the girdles (ver. 29). After all parts of the holy tent and of the sacred garments were finished, they were submitted to Moses for examination; he declared them all in perfect accordance with the precepts of God, and blessed the people (vers. 32—43).—On the first day of the first month in the second year, after the exodus from Egypt, Moses was commanded to rear up the Tabernacle, to anoint it and its utensils; and to wash, clothe, and anoint Aaron and his sons (xl. 1—15). When Moses had strictly executed all these injunctions (vers. 16—33), the cloud covered the tent, and the glory of God filled the habitation; Moses was unable to enter. When the cloud arose from the Tabernacle, the Israelites continued their journeys; when it rested on it, they encamped; during the day a cloud, and during the night a fire was on the Tabernacle, and assured the Israelites of the immediate presence and protection of their God (vers. 34—38).

1. Now only Moses communicated to the people the Divine commands concerning the holy service contained in chap. xxv.—xxxi.; after the covenant which had been broken by the worship of the golden calf (xxxii.) had been renewed (xxxiii., xxxiv.).—The people was assembled, because all should participate in the holy work.

2—3. Whilst the law concerning Sab-

These *are* the words which the Lord hath commanded, that *you* should do them. 2. Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you a holy *day*, a great day of rest to the Lord: whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death. 3. You shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations on the Sabbath day.— 4. And Moses spoke to all the congregation of the children of Israel, saying, This *is* the thing which the Lord commanded, saying, 5. Take from among you an offering to the Lord: whosoever *is* of a willing heart, let him bring it, the offering of the Lord; gold, and silver, and brass, 6. And blue, and red, and crimson, and fine linen, and goats' *hair*, 7. And rams' skins dyed red, and badgers' skins, and acacia wood, 8. And oil for the lights, and spices for anointing oil, and for incense of perfumes, 9. And onyx-stones, and stones for setting, for the ephod and for the breast-plate. 10. And every wise-hearted among you shall come, and make all that the Lord hath commanded; 11. The Tabernacle, its tent, and its covering, its taches, and its boards, its bars, its pillars, and its sockets; 12. The ark, and its staves, the mercy-seat, and the vail *as a* hanging; 13. The table, and its

bath *concludes* the precepts of God about the Tabernacle (xxxi. 12, 17), Moses *begins* them with it; because the sanctification of the Sabbath, which is a sign of Covenant between God and Israel, and which is intended to lead to a spiritual and internal life, is the safest guarantee of the future faithfulness of Israel. This law is here, therefore, not merely repeated to show, "that the work of the Tabernacle is not allowed on Sabbath."—About the reason why no fire should be kindled on the day of rest, see p. 357; compare also *Talm.*, Jebam. 6, *b.* It has been remarked, that this command could not materially inconvenience the inhabitants of Palestine, since they take one principal meal towards the evening; they could therefore prepare one on Friday afternoon, and another on Saturday immediately after dusk. But this is erroneous; it was considered a part of the Sabbath rocreation to enjoy a cheerful meal during the day, not after its conclusion; and in xvi. 23, it is expresaly commanded to prepare, on the sixth day, the food of the Sabbath. It is known that the Caraites observe this law to the very letter, and suffer in their houses on Sabbath neither light nor fire; and the efforts which some more liberal members of that sect have made to relax the rigour of this very inconvenient practice (for instance, Elijah Bechizi, in the fifteenth century), have proved unsuccessful.

4. The second לאמר signifies "to tell you," since not the words of God, but those of Moses follow.—About the stuffs here enumerated, see p. 485—491.

11. About the difference between משכן and אהל, see p. 510.

11—19. See xxxi. 2—11.

כָּל־כֵּלָיו וְאֵת לֶחֶם הַפָּנִים׃ 14 וְאֶת־מְנֹרַת הַמָּאוֹר וְאֶת־כֵּלֶיהָ
וְאֶת־נֵרֹתֶיהָ וְאֵת שֶׁמֶן הַמָּאוֹר׃ 15 וְאֶת־מִזְבַּח הַקְּטֹרֶת וְאֶת־בַּדָּיו
וְאֵת שֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה וְאֵת קְטֹרֶת הַסַּמִּים וְאֶת־מָסַךְ הַפֶּתַח לְפֶתַח
הַמִּשְׁכָּן׃ 16 אֵת ׀ מִזְבַּח הָעֹלָה וְאֶת־מִכְבַּר הַנְּחֹשֶׁת אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ
אֶת־בַּדָּיו וְאֶת־כָּל־כֵּלָיו אֶת־הַכִּיֹּר וְאֶת־כַּנּוֹ׃ 17 אֵת קַלְעֵי
הֶחָצֵר אֶת־עַמֻּדָיו וְאֶת־אֲדָנֶיהָ וְאֵת מָסַךְ שַׁעַר הֶחָצֵר׃ 18 אֶת־
יִתְדֹת הַמִּשְׁכָּן וְאֶת־יִתְדֹת הֶחָצֵר וְאֶת־מֵיתְרֵיהֶם׃ 19 אֶת־בִּגְדֵי
הַשְּׂרָד לְשָׁרֵת בַּקֹּדֶשׁ אֶת־בִּגְדֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ לְאַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן וְאֶת־בִּגְדֵי
בָנָיו לְכַהֵן׃ 20 וַיֵּצְאוּ כָּל־עֲדַת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִלִּפְנֵי מֹשֶׁה׃ שני
21 וַיָּבֹאוּ כָּל־אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־נְשָׂאוֹ לִבּוֹ וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר נָדְבָה רוּחוֹ אֹתוֹ
הֵבִיאוּ אֶת־תְּרוּמַת יְהוָה לִמְלֶאכֶת אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וּלְכָל־עֲבֹדָתוֹ
וּלְבִגְדֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ׃ 22 וַיָּבֹאוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים עַל־הַנָּשִׁים כֹּל ׀ נְדִיב לֵב
הֵבִיאוּ חָח וָנֶזֶם וְטַבַּעַת וְכוּמָז כָּל־כְּלִי זָהָב וְכָל־אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר הֵנִיף
תְּנוּפַת זָהָב לַיהוָה׃ 23 וְכָל־אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־נִמְצָא אִתּוֹ תְּכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן
וְתוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי וְשֵׁשׁ וְעִזִּים וְעֹרֹת אֵילִם מְאָדָּמִים וְעֹרֹת תְּחָשִׁים
הֵבִיאוּ׃ 24 כָּל־מֵרִים תְּרוּמַת כֶּסֶף וּנְחֹשֶׁת הֵבִיאוּ אֵת תְּרוּמַת
יְהוָה וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר נִמְצָא אִתּוֹ עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים לְכָל־מְלֶאכֶת הָעֲבֹדָה
הֵבִיאוּ׃ 25 וְכָל־אִשָּׁה חַכְמַת־לֵב בְּיָדֶיהָ טָווּ וַיָּבִיאוּ מַטְוֶה אֶת־
הַתְּכֵלֶת וְאֶת־הָאַרְגָּמָן אֶת־תּוֹלַעַת הַשָּׁנִי וְאֶת־הַשֵּׁשׁ׃ 26 וְכָל־
הַנָּשִׁים אֲשֶׁר נָשָׂא לִבָּן אֹתָנָה בְּחָכְמָה טָווּ אֶת־הָעִזִּים׃ 27 וְהַנְּשִׂאִם
הֵבִיאוּ אֵת אַבְנֵי הַשֹּׁהַם וְאֵת אַבְנֵי הַמִּלֻּאִים לָאֵפוֹד וְלַחֹשֶׁן׃

22. על הנשים, "together with the women," not "after the women"; compare Jerem. iv. 20; Eze. vii. 26, etc.—חח, *nose-ring* (*Bochart*, Hier. i. p. 764; Sept. σφραγῖδες), also used of those rings which were put into the nostrils of animals to tame them (2 Kings xix. 28; Isaiah xxxvii. 29, etc.); others, less probably, *hook* or *clasp*, to fasten female garments; or *bracelet*. — כומז, originally globe or ball, then a chain or necklace, consisting of little golden globules strung together (compare Num. xxxi. 50; *Diod. Sic.* iii. 44), called in Latin *bulla* or *baccatum monile*. About the sources of the wealth of the Israelites in that time, see note on xxv. 3.

26. אתנה = אתן, as אתכה = אתך, xxix. 35.

27. According to ancient interpreters,

staves, and all its vessels, and the shew-bread; 14. And the candlestick for the light, and its vessels, and its lamps, with the oil for the light, 15. And the altar of incense, and its staves, and the anointing oil, and the incense of perfumes, and the hanging at the door, for the door of the Tabernacle; 16. The altar of burnt-offering, with its brazen grate, its staves, and all its vessels, the laver and its base; 17. The hangings of the Court, its pillars, and their sockets, and the hanging *for the* door of the Court; 18. The pins of the Tabernacle, and the pins of the Court, and their cords; 19. The garments of service, to do service in the holy *place*, the holy garments for Aaron the priest, and the garments of his sons, to serve as priests.—20. And all the congregation of the children of Israel departed from the presence of Moses. 21. And they came, every one whose heart impelled him, and every one whom his spirit made willing, *and* they brought the Lord's offering to the work of the Tent of Meeting, and for all its service, and for the holy garments. 22. And they came, both men and women, as many as were willing-hearted, and brought [1]nose-rings, and ear-rings, and [2]necklaces, all articles of gold: and every man who offered an offering of gold to the Lord. 23. And every man with whom was found blue, and red, and crimson, and fine linen, and goats' *hair*, and red skins of rams, and badgers' skins, brought *them*. 24. Every one who wished to offer an offering of silver and brass brought the Lord's offering: and every man, with whom was found acacia wood for any work of the service, brought *it*. 25. And all the women who were wise-hearted spun with their hands, and brought that which they had spun, *both* of blue, and of red, *and* of crimson, and of fine linen. 26. And all the women whose heart impelled them in wisdom spun goats' *hair*. 27. And the chiefs brought onyx-stones, and stones for setting, for the ephod, and for

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Bracelets. [2] Tablets.

the chiefs of Israel brought the precious stones for the ephod and the breast-plate, with the names of their respective tribes already engraved on them. But first the

28 וְאֶת־הַבֹּשֶׂם וְאֶת־הַשָּׁמֶן לְמָאוֹר וּלְשֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה וְלִקְטֹרֶת
הַסַּמִּים׃ 29 כָּל־אִישׁ וְאִשָּׁה אֲשֶׁר נָדַב לִבָּם אֹתָם לְהָבִיא לְכָל־
הַמְּלָאכָה אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה לַעֲשׂוֹת בְּיַד־מֹשֶׁה הֵבִיאוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל
נְדָבָה לַיהוָה׃ פ שלישי (שני כשהן מחוברין)
30 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל רְאוּ קָרָא יְהוָה בְּשֵׁם בְּצַלְאֵל בֶּן
אוּרִי בֶן־חוּר לְמַטֵּה יְהוּדָה׃ 31 וַיְמַלֵּא אֹתוֹ רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים
בְּחָכְמָה בִּתְבוּנָה וּבְדַעַת וּבְכָל־מְלָאכָה׃ 32 וְלַחְשֹׁב מַחֲשָׁבֹת
לַעֲשֹׂת בַּזָּהָב וּבַכֶּסֶף וּבַנְּחֹשֶׁת׃ 33 וּבַחֲרֹשֶׁת אֶבֶן לְמַלֹּאת
וּבַחֲרֹשֶׁת עֵץ לַעֲשׂוֹת בְּכָל־מְלֶאכֶת מַחֲשָׁבֶת׃ 34 וּלְהוֹרֹת נָתַן
בְּלִבּוֹ הוּא וְאָהֳלִיאָב בֶּן־אֲחִיסָמָךְ לְמַטֵּה־דָן׃ 35 מִלֵּא אֹתָם חָכְמַת־
לֵב לַעֲשׂוֹת כָּל־מְלֶאכֶת חָרָשׁ וְחֹשֵׁב וְרֹקֵם בַּתְּכֵלֶת וּבָאַרְגָּמָן
בְּתוֹלַעַת הַשָּׁנִי וּבַשֵּׁשׁ וְאֹרֵג עֹשֵׂי כָּל־מְלָאכָה וְחֹשְׁבֵי
מַחֲשָׁבֹת׃

materials alone were collected, and then only the artists were appointed and invited to work them into the required utensils or ornaments (ver. 30, *et seq.*); for the works demanded a common supervision and control; or else some parts might have been produced in superfluity, others in too small quantity; the statement in xxxvi. 6, does not militate against this conception; for only when all the works were completed, the people could be requested not to bring any more materials.

34. The nominative הוא is used instead of the possessive pronoun, because the substantive is emphatically repeated, and another noun added.

לו 1 וְעָשָׂה בְצַלְאֵל וְאָהֳלִיאָב וְכֹל אִישׁ חֲכַם־לֵב אֲשֶׁר נָתַן
יְהוָה חָכְמָה וּתְבוּנָה בָּהֵמָּה לָדַעַת לַעֲשֹׂת אֶת־כָּל־
מְלֶאכֶת עֲבֹדַת הַקֹּדֶשׁ לְכֹל אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה יְהוָה׃ 2 וַיִּקְרָא מֹשֶׁה
אֶל־בְּצַלְאֵל וְאֶל־אָהֳלִיאָב וְאֶל כָּל־אִישׁ חֲכַם־לֵב אֲשֶׁר
נָתַן יְהוָה חָכְמָה בְּלִבּוֹ כֹּל אֲשֶׁר נְשָׂאוֹ לִבּוֹ לְקָרְבָה אֶל־
הַמְּלָאכָה לַעֲשֹׂת אֹתָהּ׃ 3 וַיִּקְחוּ מִלִּפְנֵי מֹשֶׁה אֵת כָּל־
הַתְּרוּמָה אֲשֶׁר הֵבִיאוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לִמְלֶאכֶת עֲבֹדַת הַקֹּדֶשׁ לַעֲשֹׂת

the breast-plate; 28. And the spice, and the oil for the light, and for the anointing oil, and for the incense of perfumes. 29. Every man and woman whose heart made them willing to offer for all manner of work, which the Lord had commanded to be made by the hand of Moses, *this* the children of Israel offered as a free-will gift to the Lord.—30. And Moses said to the children of Israel, See, the Lord hath called by name Bezaleel the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah; 31. And He hath filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship; 32. And to devise skilful designs, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass, 33. And in the cutting of stones, to set *them*, and in carving of wood, to work in all manner of skilful work. 34. And He hath given in his heart to teach, *both in* his *heart* and *that of* Aholiab, the son of Ahisamach, of the tribe of Dan. 35. He hath filled them with wisdom of heart, to work all manner of work, of the artificer, and of the [1]skilful weaver, and of the embroiderer, in blue, and in red, in crimson, and in fine linen, and of the weaver, and of those who do any work, and of those who devise skilful designs.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Cunning workman.

Chap. XXXVI. 1. [1]And Bezaleel and Aholiab shall make, and every wise-hearted man, to whom the Lord hath given wisdom and understanding to know how to work all manner of work for the service of the Sanctuary, according to all which the Lord hath commanded.—2. And Moses called Bezaleel and Aholiab, and every wise-hearted man, in whose heart the Lord had given wisdom, *even* every one whose heart impelled him to approach the work to do it. 3. And they received of Moses all the offering, which the children of Israel had brought for the work of the service of the Sanctuary, to make it. And they

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Then wrought Bezaleel and Aholiab.

אֹתָהּ וְהֵם הֵבִיאוּ אֵלָיו עוֹד נְדָבָה בַּבֹּקֶר בַּבֹּקֶר׃ 4 וַיָּבֹאוּ כָּל־
הַחֲכָמִים הָעֹשִׂים אֵת כָּל־מְלֶאכֶת הַקֹּדֶשׁ אִישׁ אִישׁ מִמְּלַאכְתּוֹ
אֲשֶׁר־הֵמָּה עֹשִׂים׃ 5 וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר מַרְבִּים הָעָם
לְהָבִיא מִדֵּי הָעֲבֹדָה לַמְּלָאכָה אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה יְהוָה לַעֲשֹׂת אֹתָהּ׃
6 וַיְצַו מֹשֶׁה וַיַּעֲבִירוּ קוֹל בַּמַּחֲנֶה לֵאמֹר אִישׁ וְאִשָּׁה אַל־יַעֲשׂוּ־
עוֹד מְלָאכָה לִתְרוּמַת הַקֹּדֶשׁ וַיִּכָּלֵא הָעָם מֵהָבִיא׃ 7 וְהַמְּלָאכָה
הָיְתָה דַיָּם לְכָל־הַמְּלָאכָה לַעֲשׂוֹת אֹתָהּ וְהוֹתֵר׃ ס רביעי 8 וַיַּעֲשׂוּ
כָל־חֲכַם־לֵב בְּעֹשֵׂי הַמְּלָאכָה אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן עֶשֶׂר יְרִיעֹת שֵׁשׁ
מָשְׁזָר וּתְכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן וְתוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי כְּרֻבִים מַעֲשֵׂה חֹשֵׁב עָשָׂה
אֹתָם׃ 9 אֹרֶךְ הַיְרִיעָה הָאַחַת שְׁמֹנֶה וְעֶשְׂרִים בָּאַמָּה וְרֹחַב
אַרְבַּע בָּאַמָּה הַיְרִיעָה הָאֶחָת מִדָּה אַחַת לְכָל־הַיְרִיעֹת׃
10 וַיְחַבֵּר אֶת־חֲמֵשׁ הַיְרִיעֹת אַחַת אֶל־אֶחָת וְחָמֵשׁ יְרִיעֹת חִבַּר
אַחַת אֶל־אֶחָת׃ 11 וַיַּעַשׂ לֻלְאֹת תְּכֵלֶת עַל שְׂפַת הַיְרִיעָה הָאֶחָת
מִקָּצָה בַּמַּחְבָּרֶת כֵּן עָשָׂה בִּשְׂפַת הַיְרִיעָה הַקִּיצוֹנָה בַּמַּחְבֶּרֶת
הַשֵּׁנִית׃ 12 חֲמִשִּׁים לֻלָאֹת עָשָׂה בַּיְרִיעָה הָאֶחָת וַחֲמִשִּׁים
לֻלָאֹת עָשָׂה בִּקְצֵה הַיְרִיעָה אֲשֶׁר בַּמַּחְבֶּרֶת הַשֵּׁנִית מַקְבִּילֹת
הַלֻּלָאֹת אַחַת אֶל־אֶחָת׃ 13 וַיַּעַשׂ חֲמִשִּׁים קַרְסֵי זָהָב וַיְחַבֵּר אֶת־
הַיְרִיעֹת אַחַת אֶל־אַחַת בַּקְּרָסִים וַיְהִי הַמִּשְׁכָּן אֶחָד׃ פ
14 וַיַּעַשׂ יְרִיעֹת עִזִּים לְאֹהֶל עַל־הַמִּשְׁכָּן עַשְׁתֵּי־עֶשְׂרֵה יְרִיעֹת עָשָׂה
אֹתָם׃ 15 אֹרֶךְ הַיְרִיעָה הָאַחַת שְׁלֹשִׁים בָּאַמָּה וְאַרְבַּע אַמּוֹת
רֹחַב הַיְרִיעָה הָאֶחָת מִדָּה אַחַת לְעַשְׁתֵּי עֶשְׂרֵה יְרִיעֹת׃ 16 וַיְחַבֵּר
אֶת־חֲמֵשׁ הַיְרִיעֹת לְבָד וְאֶת־שֵׁשׁ הַיְרִיעֹת לְבָד׃ 17 וַיַּעַשׂ לֻלָאֹת
חֲמִשִּׁים עַל שְׂפַת הַיְרִיעָה הַקִּיצֹנָה בַּמַּחְבָּרֶת וַחֲמִשִּׁים לֻלָאֹת עָשָׂה

7. דַּיָּם is an adverb, like ריקם, פתעם, etc., or perhaps, "sufficient for them," as דַּיֶּךָּ, "sufficient for thee," Prov. xxv. 16.

8—38. See xxvi. Although even literal repetitions of the same occurrence, or the same command, are not unusual in the Biblical style (see Gen. xxiv), the lengthened and accurate reiteration of the description of the holy vessels seems to imply their importance, their significance, and their symbolical character; Moses had seen their models on the

brought yet to him free-will gifts every morning. 4. And all the wise men who wrought all the work of the Sanctuary, came every man from his work which they made; 5. And they spoke to Moses, saying, The people bring much more than enough for the service of the work, which the Lord commanded to make. 6. And Moses commanded, and they caused it to be proclaimed throughout the camp, saying, Let neither man nor woman make any more work for the offering of the Sanctuary. So the people were restrained from bringing. 7. For the material they had was sufficient for all the work to make it, and too much.—8. And so every wise-hearted man among them who wrought [1]the work, made the habitation ten curtains *of* fine twined linen, and blue, and red, and crimson: *with* Cherubim of the work of the skilful weaver made he them. 9. The length of the one curtain *was* eight and twenty cubits, and the breadth of the one curtain four cubits: one measure *was* for all the curtains. 10. And he coupled the five curtains one to another: and *the other* five curtains he coupled one to another. 11. And he made loops of blue upon the border of the one curtain from the edge in the coupling: and the same he made in the border of the uttermost curtain in the second coupling. 12. Fifty loops made he in the one curtain, and fifty loops made he in the edge of the curtain which *was* in the second coupling: the loops corresponded one with another. 13. And he made fifty taches of gold, and coupled the curtains one to another with the taches: so the habitation became one. 14. And he made curtains *of* goats' *hair* for the tent over the habitation: eleven curtains he made them. 15. The length of the one curtain *was* thirty cubits, and four cubits *was* the breadth of the one curtain: one measure *was* for the eleven curtains. 16. And he coupled five curtains by themselves, and six curtains by themselves. 17. And he made fifty loops on the border of the curtain *which was* uttermost in the coupling, and fifty loops made he on the border of the

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—The work of the Tabernacle, made, etc.

עַל־שְׂפַת הַיְרִיעָה הַחֹבֶרֶת הַשֵּׁנִית׃ 18 וַיַּעַשׂ קַרְסֵי נְחֹשֶׁת חֲמִשִּׁים
לְחַבֵּר אֶת־הָאֹהֶל לִהְיֹת אֶחָד׃ 19 וַיַּעַשׂ מִכְסֶה לָאֹהֶל עֹרֹת אֵילִם
מְאָדָּמִים וּמִכְסֵה עֹרֹת תְּחָשִׁים מִלְמָעְלָה׃ ס חמישי 20 וַיַּעַשׂ
אֶת־הַקְּרָשִׁים לַמִּשְׁכָּן עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים עֹמְדִים׃ 21 עֶשֶׂר אַמֹּת אֹרֶךְ
הַקָּרֶשׁ וְאַמָּה וַחֲצִי הָאַמָּה רֹחַב הַקֶּרֶשׁ הָאֶחָד׃ 22 שְׁתֵּי יָדֹת
לַקֶּרֶשׁ הָאֶחָד מְשֻׁלָּבֹת אַחַת אֶל־אֶחָת כֵּן עָשָׂה לְכֹל קַרְשֵׁי הַמִּשְׁכָּן׃
23 וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת־הַקְּרָשִׁים לַמִּשְׁכָּן עֶשְׂרִים קְרָשִׁים לִפְאַת נֶגֶב
תֵּימָנָה׃ 24 וְאַרְבָּעִים אַדְנֵי־כֶסֶף עָשָׂה תַּחַת עֶשְׂרִים הַקְּרָשִׁים
שְׁנֵי אֲדָנִים תַּחַת־הַקֶּרֶשׁ הָאֶחָד לִשְׁתֵּי יְדֹתָיו וּשְׁנֵי אֲדָנִים תַּחַת־
הַקֶּרֶשׁ הָאֶחָד לִשְׁתֵּי יְדֹתָיו׃ 25 וּלְצֶלַע הַמִּשְׁכָּן הַשֵּׁנִית לִפְאַת
צָפוֹן עָשָׂה עֶשְׂרִים קְרָשִׁים׃ 26 וְאַרְבָּעִים אַדְנֵיהֶם כָּסֶף שְׁנֵי
אֲדָנִים תַּחַת הַקֶּרֶשׁ הָאֶחָד וּשְׁנֵי אֲדָנִים תַּחַת הַקֶּרֶשׁ הָאֶחָד׃
27 וּלְיַרְכְּתֵי הַמִּשְׁכָּן יָמָּה עָשָׂה שִׁשָּׁה קְרָשִׁים׃ 28 וּשְׁנֵי קְרָשִׁים
עָשָׂה לִמְקֻצְעֹת הַמִּשְׁכָּן בַּיַּרְכָתָיִם׃ 29 וְהָיוּ תוֹאֲמִם מִלְּמַטָּה
וְיַחְדָּו יִהְיוּ תַמִּים אֶל־רֹאשׁוֹ אֶל־הַטַּבַּעַת הָאֶחָת כֵּן עָשָׂה
לִשְׁנֵיהֶם לִשְׁנֵי הַמִּקְצֹעֹת׃ 30 וְהָיוּ שְׁמֹנָה קְרָשִׁים וְאַדְנֵיהֶם
כֶּסֶף שִׁשָּׁה עָשָׂר אֲדָנִים שְׁנֵי אֲדָנִים תַּחַת הַקֶּרֶשׁ
הָאֶחָד׃ 31 וַיַּעַשׂ בְּרִיחֵי עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים חֲמִשָּׁה לְקַרְשֵׁי צֶלַע־
הַמִּשְׁכָּן הָאֶחָת׃ 32 וַחֲמִשָּׁה בְרִיחִם לְקַרְשֵׁי צֶלַע־הַמִּשְׁכָּן
הַשֵּׁנִית וַחֲמִשָּׁה בְרִיחִם לְקַרְשֵׁי הַמִּשְׁכָּן לַיַּרְכָתַיִם יָמָּה׃ 33 וַיַּעַשׂ
אֶת־הַבְּרִיחַ הַתִּיכֹן לִבְרֹחַ בְּתוֹךְ הַקְּרָשִׁים מִן־הַקָּצֶה אֶל־הַקָּצֶה׃
34 וְאֶת־הַקְּרָשִׁים צִפָּה זָהָב וְאֶת־טַבְּעֹתָם עָשָׂה זָהָב בָּתִּים
לַבְּרִיחִם וַיְצַף אֶת־הַבְּרִיחִם זָהָב׃ 35 וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת־הַפָּרֹכֶת תְּכֵלֶת
וְאַרְגָּמָן וְתוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי וְשֵׁשׁ מָשְׁזָר מַעֲשֵׂה חֹשֵׁב עָשָׂה אֹתָהּ כְּרֻבִים׃
36 וַיַּעַשׂ לָהּ אַרְבָּעָה עַמּוּדֵי שִׁטִּים וַיְצַפֵּם זָהָב וָוֵיהֶם זָהָב

mount (xxv. 9, 40); and he watched that they were conscientiously executed according to the Divine prototypes.—In this and the following chapters the Alexan-

curtain in the second coupling. 18. And he made fifty taches *of* brass to couple the tent together, that it might be one. 19. And he made a covering for the tent *of* rams' skins dyed red, and a covering *of* badgers' skins above *that*.—20. And he made the boards for the Tabernacle *of* acacia wood, standing up. 21. The length of the board *was* ten cubits, and the breadth of one board one cubit and a half. 22. One board had two tenons, arranged one against the other: thus did he make for all the boards of the Tabernacle. 23. And he made the boards for the Tabernacle, twenty boards for the south side, southward: 24. And forty sockets of silver he made under the twenty boards; two sockets under the board for its two tenons, and two sockets under another board for its two tenons. 25. And for the second side of the Tabernacle, on the north side, he made twenty boards. 26. And their forty sockets *of* silver; two sockets under the one board, and two sockets under another board. 27. And for the side of the Tabernacle westward he made six boards. 28. And two boards made he at the corners of the Tabernacle in the two sides. 29. And they were double beneath, and at the same time they were double above, at the one ring: thus he did to both of them in both the corners. 30. And there were eight boards; and their sockets *were* of silver, sixteen sockets, under every board two sockets.—31. And he made bars of acacia wood; five for the boards of the one side of the Tabernacle, 32. And five bars for the boards of the other side of the Tabernacle, and five bars for the boards of the Tabernacle for the side westward. 33. And he made the middle bar to pass through the boards from one end to the other. 34. And he overlaid the boards with gold, and made their rings *of* gold *to be* places for the bars, and overlaid the bars with gold.—35. And he made a vail *of* blue, red, and crimson, and fine twined linen: of the work of the skilful weaver he made it, *with* Cherubim. 36. And he made thereto four pillars *of* acacia *wood*, and overlaid them with gold: their hooks *were of* gold; and he cast for them four sockets of

וַיִּצֹק לָהֶם אַרְבָּעָה אַדְנֵי־כָֽסֶף׃ 37 וַיַּעַשׂ מָסָךְ לְפֶתַח הָאֹהֶל
תְּכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן וְתוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי וְשֵׁשׁ מָשְׁזָר מַעֲשֵׂה רֹקֵם׃ 38 וְאֶת־
עַמּוּדָיו חֲמִשָּׁה וְאֶת־וָוֵיהֶם וְצִפָּה רָאשֵׁיהֶם וַחֲשֻׁקֵיהֶם זָהָב וְאַדְנֵיהֶם
חֲמִשָּׁה נְחֹשֶׁת׃ פ

drian version contains numerous deviations from, and transpositions of the Hebrew text, so that even the division into verses is doubtful.

לז 1 וַיַּעַשׂ בְּצַלְאֵל אֶת־הָאָרֹן עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים אַמָּתַיִם וָחֵצִי אָרְכּוֹ
וְאַמָּה וָחֵצִי רָחְבּוֹ וְאַמָּה וָחֵצִי קֹמָתוֹ׃ 2 וַיְצַפֵּהוּ זָהָב טָהוֹר
מִבַּיִת וּמִחוּץ וַיַּעַשׂ לוֹ זֵר זָהָב סָבִיב׃ 3 וַיִּצֹק לוֹ אַרְבַּע טַבְּעֹת
זָהָב עַל אַרְבַּע פַּעֲמֹתָיו וּשְׁתֵּי טַבָּעֹת עַל־צַלְעוֹ הָאֶחָת וּשְׁתֵּי
טַבָּעֹת עַל־צַלְעוֹ הַשֵּׁנִית׃ 4 וַיַּעַשׂ בַּדֵּי עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים וַיְצַף אֹתָם זָהָב׃
5 וַיָּבֵא אֶת־הַבַּדִּים בַּטַּבָּעֹת עַל צַלְעֹת הָאָרֹן לָשֵׂאת אֶת־הָאָרֹן׃
6 וַיַּעַשׂ כַּפֹּרֶת זָהָב טָהוֹר אַמָּתַיִם וָחֵצִי אָרְכָּהּ וְאַמָּה וָחֵצִי רָחְבָּהּ׃
7 וַיַּעַשׂ שְׁנֵי כְרֻבִים זָהָב מִקְשָׁה עָשָׂה אֹתָם מִשְּׁנֵי קְצוֹת הַכַּפֹּרֶת׃
8 כְּרוּב אֶחָד מִקָּצָה מִזֶּה וּכְרוּב־אֶחָד מִקָּצָה מִזֶּה מִן־הַכַּפֹּרֶת
עָשָׂה אֶת הַכְּרֻבִים מִשְּׁנֵי קְצוֹתָו׃ 9 וַיִּהְיוּ הַכְּרֻבִים פֹּרְשֵׂי כְנָפַיִם
לְמַעְלָה סֹכְכִים בְּכַנְפֵיהֶם עַל־הַכַּפֹּרֶת וּפְנֵיהֶם אִישׁ אֶל־אָחִיו אֶל־
הַכַּפֹּרֶת הָיוּ פְּנֵי הַכְּרֻבִים׃ פ
10 וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת־הַשֻּׁלְחָן עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים אַמָּתַיִם אָרְכּוֹ וְאַמָּה רָחְבּוֹ וְאַמָּה
וָחֵצִי קֹמָתוֹ׃ 11 וַיְצַף אֹתוֹ זָהָב טָהוֹר וַיַּעַשׂ לוֹ זֵר זָהָב סָבִיב׃
12 וַיַּעַשׂ לוֹ מִסְגֶּרֶת טֹפַח סָבִיב וַיַּעַשׂ זֵר־זָהָב לְמִסְגַּרְתּוֹ סָבִיב׃
13 וַיִּצֹק לוֹ אַרְבַּע טַבְּעֹת זָהָב וַיִּתֵּן אֶת־הַטַּבָּעֹת עַל אַרְבַּע הַפֵּאֹת
אֲשֶׁר לְאַרְבַּע רַגְלָיו׃ 14 לְעֻמַּת הַמִּסְגֶּרֶת הָיוּ הַטַּבָּעֹת בָּתִּים
לַבַּדִּים לָשֵׂאת אֶת־הַשֻּׁלְחָן׃ 15 וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת־הַבַּדִּים עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים

° קצותיו קרי

CHAPTER XXXVII.

1. Ver. 1—24, see xxv. 10—40; ver. 25—28, xxx. 1—5; ver. 29, xxx. 23—38. —In regular order, first the vessels of the Holy of Holies, and then those of the

silver.—37. And he made a hanging for the door of the Tabernacle *of* blue, and red, and crimson, and fine twined linen, *of* the work of the embroiderer, 38. And its five pillars, with their hooks: and he overlaid their capitals and their rods with gold, and their five sockets *were of* brass.

CHAP. XXXVII. 1. And Bezaleel made the ark *of* acacia wood: two cubits and a half *was* its length, and a cubit and a half its breadth, and a cubit and a half its height. 2. And he overlaid it with pure gold within and without, and made a crown of gold to it round about. 3. And he cast for it four rings of gold on its four feet; two rings upon the one side of it, and two rings upon the other side of it. 4. And he made staves of acacia wood, and overlaid them with gold. 5. And he put the staves into the rings on the sides of the ark, to bear the ark.—6. And he made the mercy-seat *of* pure gold: two cubits and a half *was* its length, and a cubit and a half its breadth. 7. And he made two Cherubim *of* gold, of beaten-work made he them, on the two ends of the mercy-seat; 8. One cherub on the one end, and another cherub on the other end: out of the mercy-seat he made the Cherubim on its two ends. 9. And the Cherubim spread out *their* wings over *it*, covering with their wings the mercy-seat, and their faces *looked* one to another; towards the mercy-seat were the faces of the Cherubim.—10. And he made the table of acacia wood: two cubits *was* its length, and a cubit its breadth, and a cubit and a half its height: 11. And he overlaid it with pure gold, and made thereto a crown of gold round about. 12. And he made to it a border of a hand-breadth round about; and made a crown of gold to its border round about. 13. And he cast for it four rings of gold, and put the rings in the four corners which *were* on its four feet. 14. Over against the border were the rings for places for the staves to bear the the table. 15. And he made the staves *of* acacia wood,

וַיְצַף אֹתָם זָהָב לָשֵׂאת אֶת־הַשֻּׁלְחָן׃ 16 וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת־הַכֵּלִים ׀ אֲשֶׁר
עַל־הַשֻּׁלְחָן אֶת־קְעָרֹתָיו וְאֶת־כַּפֹּתָיו וְאֵת מְנַקִּיֹּתָיו וְאֶת־הַקְּשָׂוֺת
אֲשֶׁר יֻסַּךְ בָּהֵן זָהָב טָהוֹר׃ פ ששי (שלישי כשהן מחוברין)
17 וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת־הַמְּנֹרָה זָהָב טָהוֹר מִקְשָׁה עָשָׂה אֶת־הַמְּנֹרָה יְרֵכָהּ
וְקָנָהּ גְּבִיעֶיהָ כַּפְתֹּרֶיהָ וּפְרָחֶיהָ מִמֶּנָּה הָיוּ׃ 18 וְשִׁשָּׁה קָנִים
יֹצְאִים מִצִּדֶּיהָ שְׁלֹשָׁה ׀ קְנֵי מְנֹרָה מִצִּדָּהּ הָאֶחָד וּשְׁלֹשָׁה קְנֵי
מְנֹרָה מִצִּדָּהּ הַשֵּׁנִי׃ 19 שְׁלֹשָׁה גְבִעִים מְשֻׁקָּדִים בַּקָּנֶה הָאֶחָד
כַּפְתֹּר וָפֶרַח וּשְׁלֹשָׁה גְבִעִים מְשֻׁקָּדִים בְּקָנֶה אֶחָד כַּפְתֹּר וָפָרַח
כֵּן לְשֵׁשֶׁת הַקָּנִים הַיֹּצְאִים מִן־הַמְּנֹרָה׃ 20 וּבַמְּנֹרָה אַרְבָּעָה
גְבִעִים מְשֻׁקָּדִים כַּפְתֹּרֶיהָ וּפְרָחֶיהָ׃ 21 וְכַפְתֹּר תַּחַת שְׁנֵי הַקָּנִים
מִמֶּנָּה וְכַפְתֹּר תַּחַת שְׁנֵי הַקָּנִים מִמֶּנָּה וְכַפְתֹּר תַּחַת־שְׁנֵי הַקָּנִים
מִמֶּנָּה לְשֵׁשֶׁת הַקָּנִים הַיֹּצְאִים מִמֶּנָּה׃ 22 כַּפְתֹּרֵיהֶם וּקְנֹתָם מִמֶּנָּה
הָיוּ כֻּלָּהּ מִקְשָׁה אַחַת זָהָב טָהוֹר׃ 23 וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת־נֵרֹתֶיהָ שִׁבְעָה
וּמַלְקָחֶיהָ וּמַחְתֹּתֶיהָ זָהָב טָהוֹר׃ 24 כִּכָּר זָהָב טָהוֹר עָשָׂה אֹתָהּ
וְאֵת כָּל־כֵּלֶיהָ׃ פ

25 וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת־מִזְבַּח הַקְּטֹרֶת עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים אַמָּה אָרְכּוֹ וְאַמָּה רָחְבּוֹ
רָבוּעַ וְאַמָּתַיִם קֹמָתוֹ מִמֶּנּוּ הָיוּ קַרְנֹתָיו׃ 26 וַיְצַף אֹתוֹ זָהָב טָהוֹר
אֶת־גַּגּוֹ וְאֶת־קִירֹתָיו סָבִיב וְאֶת־קַרְנֹתָיו וַיַּעַשׂ לוֹ זֵר זָהָב סָבִיב׃
27 וּשְׁתֵּי טַבְּעֹת זָהָב עָשָׂה־לוֹ ׀ מִתַּחַת לְזֵרוֹ עַל שְׁתֵּי צַלְעֹתָיו
עַל שְׁנֵי צִדָּיו לְבָתִּים לְבַדִּים לָשֵׂאת אֹתוֹ בָּהֶם׃ 28 וַיַּעַשׂ
אֶת־הַבַּדִּים עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים וַיְצַף אֹתָם זָהָב׃ 29 וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת־
שֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה קֹדֶשׁ וְאֶת־קְטֹרֶת הַסַּמִּים טָהוֹר מַעֲשֵׂה
רֹקֵחַ׃ ס שביעי (רביעי כשהן מחוברין)

Holy are described, whilst the following chapter mentions the construction of the Court and its utensils.

29. This verse alone interrupts the regular enumeration, evidently because the incense belonged to the service of the Holy, not of the Court.

and overlaid them with gold, to bear the table. 16. And he made the vessels which *were* upon the table, its dishes, and its bowls, and its cups with which the libations were made, *of* pure gold.—17. And he made the candlestick *of* pure gold: *of* beaten-work made he the candlestick; its base and its shaft, its calyxes, its apples, and its blossoms, were of the same: 18. And six branches came out of its sides; three branches of the candlestick out of the one side thereof, and three branches of the candlestick out of the other side. 19. Three calyxes of almond-flowers, with apple and blossom, on one branch; and three calyxes of almond-flowers, with apple and blossom, on another branch; so on the six branches coming out of the candlestick. 20. And on the candlestick *were* four calyxes of almond-flowers, with their apples and blossoms: 21. And an apple under two branches of the same, and an apple under two branches of the same, and an apple under two branches of the same, according to the six branches coming out of it. 22. Their apples and their branches were of the same; all of it *was* one beaten-work *of* pure gold. 23. And he made its seven lamps, and its snuffers, and its fire-shovels, *of* pure gold. 24. *Of* a talent of pure gold made he it and all its vessels.—25. And he made the incense altar *of* acacia wood: its length *was* a cubit, and its breadth a cubit; *it was* square; and two cubits *was* its height, its horns were of the same. 26. And he overlaid it with pure gold, *both* its top and its sides round about, and its horns; and he made to it a crown of gold round about. 27. And he made two rings of gold for it under its crown, at its two corners, upon its two sides, for places for the staves to bear it with them. 28. And he made the staves of acacia wood, and overlaid them with gold.—29. And he made the holy anointing oil, and the pure incense of perfumes, according to the work of the ointment-maker.

לח 1 וַיַּ֛עַשׂ אֶת־מִזְבַּ֥ח הָעֹלָ֖ה עֲצֵ֣י שִׁטִּ֑ים חָמֵשׁ֩ אַמּ֨וֹת אָרְכּ֜וֹ
וְחָֽמֵשׁ־אַמּ֤וֹת רָחְבּוֹ֙ רָב֔וּעַ וְשָׁלֹ֥שׁ אַמּ֖וֹת קֹמָתֽוֹ׃ 2 וַיַּ֣עַשׂ קַרְנֹתָ֗יו
עַ֚ל אַרְבַּ֣ע פִּנֹּתָ֔יו מִמֶּ֖נּוּ הָי֣וּ קַרְנֹתָ֑יו וַיְצַ֥ף אֹת֖וֹ נְחֹֽשֶׁת׃ 3 וַיַּ֜עַשׂ
אֶת־כָּל־כְּלֵ֣י הַמִּזְבֵּ֗חַ אֶת־הַסִּירֹ֤ת וְאֶת־הַיָּעִים֙ וְאֶת־הַמִּזְרָקֹ֔ת אֶת־
הַמִּזְלָגֹ֖ת וְאֶת־הַמַּחְתֹּ֑ת כָּל־כֵּלָ֖יו עָשָׂ֥ה נְחֹֽשֶׁת׃ 4 וַיַּ֤עַשׂ לַמִּזְבֵּ֙חַ֙
מִכְבָּ֔ר מַעֲשֵׂ֖ה רֶ֣שֶׁת נְחֹ֑שֶׁת תַּ֧חַת כַּרְכֻּבּ֛וֹ מִלְּמַטָּ֖ה עַד־חֶצְיֽוֹ׃
5 וַיִּצֹ֞ק אַרְבַּ֧ע טַבָּעֹ֛ת בְּאַרְבַּ֥ע הַקְּצָוֺ֖ת לְמִכְבַּ֣ר הַנְּחֹ֑שֶׁת בָּתִּ֖ים
לַבַּדִּֽים׃ 6 וַיַּ֥עַשׂ אֶת־הַבַּדִּ֖ים עֲצֵ֣י שִׁטִּ֑ים וַיְצַ֥ף אֹתָ֖ם נְחֹֽשֶׁת׃
7 וַיָּבֵ֨א אֶת־הַבַּדִּ֜ים בַּטַּבָּעֹ֗ת עַ֚ל צַלְעֹ֣ת הַמִּזְבֵּ֔חַ לָשֵׂ֥את אֹת֖וֹ בָּהֶ֑ם
נְב֥וּב לֻחֹ֖ת עָשָׂ֥ה אֹתֽוֹ׃ ס 8 וַיַּ֗עַשׂ אֵ֚ת
הַכִּיּ֣וֹר נְחֹ֔שֶׁת וְאֵ֖ת כַּנּ֣וֹ נְחֹ֑שֶׁת בְּמַרְאֹת֙ הַצֹּ֣בְאֹ֔ת אֲשֶׁ֣ר צָֽבְא֔וּ פֶּ֖תַח
אֹ֥הֶל מוֹעֵֽד׃ ס 9 וַיַּ֖עַשׂ אֶת־הֶחָצֵ֑ר
לִפְאַ֣ת ׀ נֶ֣גֶב תֵּימָ֗נָה קַלְעֵ֤י הֶֽחָצֵר֙ שֵׁ֣שׁ מָשְׁזָ֔ר מֵאָ֖ה בָּאַמָּֽה׃
10 עַמּֽוּדֵיהֶ֣ם עֶשְׂרִ֔ים וְאַדְנֵיהֶ֥ם עֶשְׂרִ֖ים נְחֹ֑שֶׁת וָוֵ֧י הָֽעַמּוּדִ֛ים
וַחֲשֻׁקֵיהֶ֖ם כָּֽסֶף׃ 11 וְלִפְאַ֤ת צָפוֹן֙ מֵאָ֣ה בָאַמָּ֔ה עַמּוּדֵיהֶ֣ם עֶשְׂרִ֔ים
וְאַדְנֵיהֶ֥ם עֶשְׂרִ֖ים נְחֹ֑שֶׁת וָוֵ֧י הָעַמּוּדִ֛ים וַחֲשֻׁקֵיהֶ֖ם כָּֽסֶף׃ 12 וְלִפְאַת־
יָ֗ם קְלָעִים֙ חֲמִשִּׁ֣ים בָּֽאַמָּ֔ה עַמּוּדֵיהֶ֥ם עֲשָׂרָ֖ה וְאַדְנֵיהֶ֣ם עֲשָׂרָ֑ה וָוֵ֧י
הָעַמֻּדִ֛ים וַחֲשׁוּקֵיהֶ֖ם כָּֽסֶף׃ 13 וְלִפְאַ֛ת קֵ֥דְמָה מִזְרָ֖חָה חֲמִשִּׁ֥ים
אַמָּֽה׃ 14 קְלָעִ֛ים חֲמֵשׁ־עֶשְׂרֵ֥ה אַמָּ֖ה אֶל־הַכָּתֵ֑ף עַמּוּדֵיהֶ֥ם

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

8. The laver and its base were made "of the mirrors of the women who served at the door of the Tent of Meeting" (במראת הצבאת אשר צבאו פתח אהל מועד). That the preposition ב, in במראת, admits this interpretation, requires no proof; the Septuagint renders *ἐκ τῶν κατόπτρων*; Targum Jonathan, מן אספקלירי, etc.; compare בה, ver. 30. It is, therefore, perfectly inappropriate to understand במארת with Baehr (and Michaelis before him), "with the mirrors," signifying that the latter were affixed on the laver to remind the priests, before entering the Holy Tabernacle, of the duty of self-examination (see p. 485). That the mirrors of the ancient Egyptians were of metal, especially of brass, is universally known; at Thebes some of these utensils have been discovered, which have almost been restored to their original polish (see *Wilkinson*, Manners iii. 384; *Rosellini*, Monumenti, II. ii. 528, *et seq.*). Although Egyptian women visited the temples, according to ancient testimonies, with mirrors in their left

CHAP. XXXVIII. 1. And he made the altar of burnt-offering *of* acacia wood: five cubits *was* its length, and five cubits its breadth; *it was* square; and three cubits its height. 2. And he made its horns on its four corners; its horns were of the same: and he overlaid it *with* brass. 3. And he made all the vessels of the altar, the pots, and its shovels, and its basins, *and* the fleshhooks, and the fire-pans: all the vessels thereof made he *of* brass. 4. And he made for the altar a brazen grate of network, under its border beneath, to the midst of it. 5. And he cast four rings for the four ends of the brazen grate, *for* places for the staves. 6. And he made the staves *of* acacia wood, and overlaid them *with* brass. 7. And he put the staves into the rings on the sides of the altar, to bear it with them; he made the altar hollow with boards.—8. And he made the laver *of* brass, and its base *of* brass, of the looking-glasses of [1] *the women* who served *at* the door of the Tent of Meeting.—9. And he made the Court: for the south side southward *were* hangings of the Court, *of* fine twined linen, one hundred cubits. 10. Their pillars *were* twenty, and their sockets twenty *of* brass; the hooks of the pillars and their rods *were of* silver. 11. And for the north side *the hangings were* one hundred cubits, their pillars *were* twenty, and their sockets twenty *of* brass; the hooks of the pillars and their rods *of* silver. 12. And for the west side *were* hangings *of* fifty cubits, their pillars ten, and their sockets ten; the hooks of the pillars and their rods *of* silver. 13. And for the east side eastward fifty cubits. 14. The hangings of the one side *of the gate were* fifteen cubits;

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Of the women assembling, which assembled.

hands, it is unnecessary to suppose with Spencer, that Moses, in order to preclude this practice among the Hebrews, ordered the women to offer their mirrors for the construction of the laver and its base. But it is still less admissible to read, with Michaelis and others, כמראת, instead of במראת, and to translate "he made the laver . . . . . *like* the mirrors," that is, as polished as the latter.—The "Tent of Meeting," is here either the tent of Moses (xxxiii. 7), or, by anticipation, the holy Tabernacle. To הצבאת, we must supply הנשים, as is evident from 1 Sam. ii. 22; and צבא signifies, to serve in the sanctuary, as appears from Numb. iv. 23; viii. 24. The translations of the Septuagint (*νηστευσασῶν αἳ ἐνήστευσαν*), and of Onkelos (נשיא דאתין לצלאה), express virtually the same sense. Impro-

שְׁלֹשָׁה וְאַדְנֵיהֶם שְׁלֹשָׁה׃ 15 וְלַכָּתֵף הַשֵּׁנִית מִזֶּה וּמִזֶּה לְשַׁעַר
הֶחָצֵר קְלָעִים חֲמֵשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה אַמָּה עַמֻּדֵיהֶם שְׁלֹשָׁה וְאַדְנֵיהֶם
שְׁלֹשָׁה׃ 16 כָּל־קַלְעֵי הֶחָצֵר סָבִיב שֵׁשׁ מָשְׁזָר׃ 17 וְהָאֲדָנִים
לָעַמֻּדִים נְחֹשֶׁת וָוֵי הָעַמּוּדִים וַחֲשׁוּקֵיהֶם כֶּסֶף וְצִפּוּי רָאשֵׁיהֶם כֶּסֶף
וְהֵם מְחֻשָּׁקִים כֶּסֶף כֹּל עַמֻּדֵי הֶחָצֵר׃ מפטיר
18 וּמָסַךְ שַׁעַר הֶחָצֵר מַעֲשֵׂה רֹקֵם תְּכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן וְתוֹלַעַת
שָׁנִי וְשֵׁשׁ מָשְׁזָר וְעֶשְׂרִים אַמָּה אֹרֶךְ וְקוֹמָה בְרֹחַב חָמֵשׁ אַמּוֹת
לְעֻמַּת קַלְעֵי הֶחָצֵר׃ 19 וְעַמֻּדֵיהֶם אַרְבָּעָה וְאַדְנֵיהֶם אַרְבָּעָה
נְחֹשֶׁת וָוֵיהֶם כֶּסֶף וְצִפּוּי רָאשֵׁיהֶם וַחֲשֻׁקֵיהֶם כָּסֶף׃ 20 וְכָל־הַיְתֵדֹת
לַמִּשְׁכָּן וְלֶחָצֵר סָבִיב נְחֹשֶׁת׃ ס

bable is the translation: "he made the laver with beautiful figures which adorned (צבה=צבא) the door of the Tabernacle."

9—20. See xxvii. 9—19.

ס ס ס

21 אֵלֶּה פְקוּדֵי הַמִּשְׁכָּן מִשְׁכַּן הָעֵדֻת אֲשֶׁר פֻּקַּד עַל־פִּי מֹשֶׁה
עֲבֹדַת הַלְוִיִּם בְּיַד אִיתָמָר בֶּן־אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן׃ 22 וּבְצַלְאֵל בֶּן־אוּרִי
בֶן־חוּר לְמַטֵּה יְהוּדָה עָשָׂה אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה׃
23 וְאִתּוֹ אָהֳלִיאָב בֶּן־אֲחִיסָמָךְ לְמַטֵּה־דָן חָרָשׁ וְחֹשֵׁב וְרֹקֵם
בַּתְּכֵלֶת וּבָאַרְגָּמָן וּבְתוֹלַעַת הַשָּׁנִי וּבַשֵּׁשׁ׃ ס 24 כָּל־
הַזָּהָב הֶעָשׂוּי לַמְּלָאכָה בְּכֹל מְלֶאכֶת הַקֹּדֶשׁ וַיְהִי ׀ זְהַב הַתְּנוּפָה
תֵּשַׁע וְעֶשְׂרִים כִּכָּר וּשְׁבַע מֵאוֹת וּשְׁלֹשִׁים שֶׁקֶל בְּשֶׁקֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ׃
25 וְכֶסֶף פְּקוּדֵי הָעֵדָה מְאַת כִּכָּר וְאֶלֶף וּשְׁבַע מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשָּׁה
וְשִׁבְעִים שֶׁקֶל בְּשֶׁקֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ׃ 26 בֶּקַע לַגֻּלְגֹּלֶת מַחֲצִית הַשֶּׁקֶל
בְּשֶׁקֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ לְכֹל הָעֹבֵר עַל־הַפְּקֻדִים מִבֶּן עֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה וָמַעְלָה

21. The tent is called the "Tabernacle of Testimony" (משכן העדות) on account of the Tables of the Law which formed its most important contents (xxxi. 18; see p. 493).

24. About the talent and shekel see note on xxi. 32.

26. The number of the Israelites above twenty years (603,550), is the same in this and in the later census, Numb. i. 46; but there were, besides, 22,000 Levites (Numb. iii. 39), who seem not to be included in our passage.

their pillars three, and their sockets three. 15. And for the other side of the Court gate, on this hand and on that hand, *were* hangings of fifteen cubits; their pillars three, and their sockets three. 16. All the hangings of the Court round about *were of* fine twined linen. 17. And the sockets for the pillars *were of* brass; the hooks of the pillars and their rods *of* silver; and the overlaying of their capitals *of* silver; and all the pillars of the Court *were* united with rods of silver. 18. And the hanging for the gate of the Court *was of* the work of the embroiderer, *of* blue, and red, and crimson, and fine twined linen: and twenty cubits *was* the length, and the height with the breadth *was* five cubits, corresponding with the hangings of the Court. 19. And their pillars *were* four, and their sockets *of* brass four; their hooks *of* silver, and the overlaying of their capitals and their rods *of* silver. 20. And all the pins of the Tabernacle, and of the Court round about, *were of* brass.—21. These are the accounts of the Tabernacle, *even* of the Tabernacle of the Testimony, as it was counted, according to the commandment of Moses, [1] *by* the service of the Levites, through Ithamar, the son of Aaron the priest. 22. And Bezaleel the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah, made all that the Lord commanded Moses. 23. And with him *was* Aholiab, son of Ahisamach, of the tribe of Dan, an artificer, and a skilful weaver, and an embroiderer in blue, and in red, and in crimson, and in fine linen.—24. And all the gold which was applied for the work, in all the holy work, the gold of the offering, was twenty-nine talents, and seven hundred and thirty shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary.—25. And the silver of those who were numbered of the congregation *was* one hundred talents, and one thousand seven hundred and seventy-five shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary: 26. A bekah for every man, *that is*, half a shekel, after the shekel of the sanctuary, for every one who passed to those who were numbered, from twenty years old and upward, for six hundred thousand and three

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—For.

לְשֵׁשׁ־מֵאוֹת אֶלֶף וּשְׁלֹשֶׁת אֲלָפִים וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשִּׁים׃ 27 וַיְהִי
מְאַת כִּכַּר הַכֶּסֶף לָצֶקֶת אֵת אַדְנֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ וְאֵת אַדְנֵי הַפָּרֹכֶת
מְאַת אֲדָנִים לִמְאַת הַכִּכָּר כִּכָּר לָאָדֶן׃ 28 וְאֶת־הָאֶלֶף וּשְׁבַע
הַמֵּאוֹת וַחֲמִשָּׁה וְשִׁבְעִים עָשָׂה וָוִים לָעַמּוּדִים וְצִפָּה רָאשֵׁיהֶם וְחִשַּׁק
אֹתָם׃ 29 וּנְחֹשֶׁת הַתְּנוּפָה שִׁבְעִים כִּכָּר וְאַלְפַּיִם וְאַרְבַּע־מֵאוֹת
שָׁקֶל׃ 30 וַיַּעַשׂ בָּהּ אֶת־אַדְנֵי פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וְאֵת מִזְבַּח
הַנְּחֹשֶׁת וְאֶת־מִכְבַּר הַנְּחֹשֶׁת אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ וְאֵת כָּל־כְּלֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ׃
31 וְאֶת־אַדְנֵי הֶחָצֵר סָבִיב וְאֶת־אַדְנֵי שַׁעַר הֶחָצֵר וְאֵת כָּל־יִתְדֹת
הַמִּשְׁכָּן וְאֶת־כָּל־יִתְדֹת הֶחָצֵר סָבִיב׃

28. According to Rosenmüller, the rods were not of solid silver, but only overlaid with this metal, as, else, the 1,775 shekels would not have sufficed; and he adduces the analogies of xl. 5, compared with xxx. 1, 3; and of xxxix. 39, compared with xxvii. 1, 2.

30, 31. The laver and its base are

לט 1 וּמִן־הַתְּכֵלֶת וְהָאַרְגָּמָן וְתוֹלַעַת הַשָּׁנִי עָשׂוּ בִגְדֵי־שְׂרָד לְשָׁרֵת
בַּקֹּדֶשׁ וַיַּעֲשׂוּ אֶת־בִּגְדֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר לְאַהֲרֹן כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה
אֶת־מֹשֶׁה׃ פ שני (חמישי כשהן מחוברין)
2 וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת־הָאֵפֹד זָהָב תְּכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן וְתוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי וְשֵׁשׁ מָשְׁזָר׃
3 וַיְרַקְּעוּ אֶת־פַּחֵי הַזָּהָב וְקִצֵּץ פְּתִילִם לַעֲשׂוֹת בְּתוֹךְ הַתְּכֵלֶת
וּבְתוֹךְ הָאַרְגָּמָן וּבְתוֹךְ תּוֹלַעַת הַשָּׁנִי וּבְתוֹךְ הַשֵּׁשׁ מַעֲשֵׂה חֹשֵׁב׃
4 כְּתֵפֹת עָשׂוּ־לוֹ חֹבְרֹת עַל־שְׁנֵי קְצוֹוֹתָו חֻבָּר׃ 5 וְחֵשֶׁב אֲפֻדָּתוֹ
אֲשֶׁר עָלָיו מִמֶּנּוּ הוּא כְּמַעֲשֵׂהוּ זָהָב תְּכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן וְתוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי
וְשֵׁשׁ מָשְׁזָר כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה׃ ס 6 וַיַּעֲשׂוּ
אֶת־אַבְנֵי הַשֹּׁהַם מֻסַבֹּת מִשְׁבְּצֹת זָהָב מְפֻתָּחֹת פִּתּוּחֵי חוֹתָם עַל־

ס קצותיו קרי

CHAPTER XXXIX.

1. About בגדי שרד, see note on xxxi. 10.

2—31. See xxviii. 6—40.

3. רקע = רקק, to spread out, to beat out metal into thin plates. These plates were then cut into narrow slips, which were afterwards, by means of a hammer and a file, rounded into the form of wires. The singular וקצץ, changes with the plural וירקעו, as very frequently in these chapters, since both the one and the other

thousand and five hundred and fifty *men*. 27. And the hundred talents of silver were for casting the sockets of the Sanctuary, and the sockets of the vail; one hundred sockets of the hundred talents, a talent for a socket. 28. And of the thousand seven hundred and seventy-five *shekels* he made hooks for the pillars, and overlaid their capitals, and made rods for them.— 29. And the brass of the offering *was* seventy talents, and two thousand and four hundred shekels. 30. And therewith he made the sockets to the door of the Tent of Meeting, and the brazen altar, and the brazen grate for it, and all the vessels of the altar. 31. And the sockets of the Court round about, and the sockets of the Court gate, and all the pins of the Tabernacle, and all the pins of the Court round about.

here not enumerated among the brazen vessels, as they were made of the mirrors which the women offered separately for that purpose.

CHAP. XXXIX. And of the blue, and the red, and the crimson, they made garments of office, to do service in the holy *place*, and made the holy garments for Aaron; as the Lord commanded Moses. 2. And he made the ephod *of* gold, blue, and red, and crimson, and fine twined linen. 3. And they beat the gold into thin plates, and cut *it into* wires, to work *it* in the blue, and in the red, and in the crimson, and in the fine linen, *with* the work of the skilful weaver. 4. They made shoulder-pieces for it, [1]coupled together: at the two ends it was coupled together. 5. And the band of the ephod, which *was* upon it, *was* of the same *piece*, *and* of the same workmanship, *of* gold, blue, and red, and crimson, and fine twined linen; as the Lord commanded Moses.—6. And they wrought the onyx stones, set in sockets of gold, graven *like* the engravings of a signet, with the names of the children of

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—To couple it together.

have an impersonal signification; this change does not always indicate that different persons executed the different parts of the works, as Rau and others inferred.

9. כפול is repeated, to show that the breast-plate was one span long, *after it was doubled*, so that its actual length was two spans; which was not expressed

שְׁמוֹת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ 7 וַיָּשֶׂם אֹתָם עַל כִּתְפֹת הָאֵפֹד אַבְנֵי זִכָּרוֹן
לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה׃ פ
8 וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת־הַחֹשֶׁן מַעֲשֵׂה חֹשֵׁב כְּמַעֲשֵׂה אֵפֹד זָהָב תְּכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן
וְתוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי וְשֵׁשׁ מָשְׁזָר׃ 9 רָבוּעַ הָיָה כָּפוּל עָשׂוּ אֶת־
הַחֹשֶׁן זֶרֶת אָרְכּוֹ וְזֶרֶת רָחְבּוֹ כָּפוּל׃ 10 וַיְמַלְאוּ־בוֹ אַרְבָּעָה
טוּרֵי אָבֶן טוּר אֹדֶם פִּטְדָה וּבָרֶקֶת הַטּוּר הָאֶחָד׃ 11 וְהַטּוּר
הַשֵּׁנִי נֹפֶךְ סַפִּיר וְיָהֲלֹם׃ 12 וְהַטּוּר הַשְּׁלִישִׁי לֶשֶׁם שְׁבוֹ וְאַחְלָמָה׃
13 וְהַטּוּר הָרְבִיעִי תַּרְשִׁישׁ שֹׁהַם וְיָשְׁפֵה מוּסַבֹּת מִשְׁבְּצֹת זָהָב
בְּמִלֻּאֹתָם׃ 14 וְהָאֲבָנִים עַל־שְׁמֹת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל הֵנָּה שְׁתֵּים
עֶשְׂרֵה עַל־שְׁמֹתָם פִּתּוּחֵי חֹתָם אִישׁ עַל־שְׁמוֹ לִשְׁנֵים עָשָׂר
שָׁבֶט׃ 15 וַיַּעֲשׂוּ עַל־הַחֹשֶׁן שַׁרְשְׁרֹת גַּבְלֻת מַעֲשֵׂה עֲבֹת זָהָב
טָהוֹר׃ 16 וַיַּעֲשׂוּ שְׁתֵּי מִשְׁבְּצֹת זָהָב וּשְׁתֵּי טַבְּעֹת זָהָב וַיִּתְּנוּ אֶת־
שְׁתֵּי הַטַּבָּעֹת עַל־שְׁנֵי קְצוֹת הַחֹשֶׁן׃ 17 וַיִּתְּנוּ שְׁתֵּי הָעֲבֹתֹת
הַזָּהָב עַל־שְׁתֵּי הַטַּבָּעֹת עַל קְצוֹת הַחֹשֶׁן׃ 18 וְאֵת שְׁתֵּי קְצוֹת
שְׁתֵּי הָעֲבֹתֹת נָתְנוּ עַל־שְׁתֵּי הַמִּשְׁבְּצֹת וַיִּתְּנֻם עַל־כִּתְפֹת הָאֵפֹד
אֶל־מוּל פָּנָיו׃ 19 וַיַּעֲשׂוּ שְׁתֵּי טַבְּעֹת זָהָב וַיָּשִׂימוּ עַל־שְׁנֵי קְצוֹת
הַחֹשֶׁן עַל־שְׂפָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר אֶל־עֵבֶר הָאֵפֹד בָּיְתָה׃ 20 וַיַּעֲשׂוּ
שְׁתֵּי טַבְּעֹת זָהָב וַיִּתְּנֻם עַל־שְׁתֵּי כִתְפֹת הָאֵפֹד מִלְּמַטָּה מִמּוּל
פָּנָיו לְעֻמַּת מֶחְבַּרְתּוֹ מִמַּעַל לְחֵשֶׁב הָאֵפֹד׃ 21 וַיִּרְכְּסוּ אֶת־
הַחֹשֶׁן מִטַּבְּעֹתָיו אֶל־טַבְּעֹת הָאֵפֹד בִּפְתִיל תְּכֵלֶת לִהְיֹת עַל־
חֵשֶׁב הָאֵפֹד וְלֹא־יִזַּח הַחֹשֶׁן מֵעַל הָאֵפֹד כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־
מֹשֶׁה׃ פ שלישי (ששי כשהן מחוברין)

in xxviii. 16, with sufficient distinctness.

17. העבתת, has the definite article, because the following substantive הזהב expresses a material, and has almost the meaning of an adjective. העבתת seems to be the status constructus, after the analogy of הַמִּזְבַּח הַנְּחֹשֶׁת, 2 Kings xvi. 14; although, in הָאָרוֹן הַבְּרִית (Josh. iii. 14), the first substantive is in the status absolutus.

21. The Samaritan text adds: ויעשו את האורים ואת התומים וכו׳; this is, however, superfluous, since the Urim and Thummim are identical with the twelve gems enumerated in vers. 10—13; see p. 541.

Israel. 7. And he put them on the shoulders of the ephod, *as* stones of memorial for the children of Israel; as the Lord commanded Moses.—8. And he made the breast-plate *with* the work of the skilful weaver, like the work of the ephod; *of* gold, blue, red, and crimson, and fine twined linen. 9. It was square; they made the breast-plate double: one span *was* its length, and one span its breadth, *being* doubled. 10. And they set in it four rows of stones: *the first* row *was* a carnelian, a topaz, and a smaragd: this *was* the first row. 11. And the second row, a carbuncle, a sapphire, and an emerald. 12. And the third row, a ligure, an agate, and an amethyst. 13. And the fourth row, a chrysolite, an onyx, and a jasper: *they were* enclosed in sockets of gold in their settings. 14. And the stones *were* according to the names of the children of Israel, twelve, according to their names, *like* the engravings of a signet, every one according to its name, for the twelve tribes. 15. And they made upon the breast-plate chains *of* wreathen work, [1]twisted in the manner of ropes, *of* pure gold. 16. And they made two sockets *of* gold, and two gold rings, and put the two rings on the two ends of the breast-plate. 17. And they put the two wreathen *chains* of gold in the two rings on the ends of the breast-plate. 18. And the *other* two ends of the two wreathen *chains* they fastened in the two sockets, and put them on the shoulder-pieces of the ephod, before it. 19. And they made two rings of gold, and put *them* on the two ends of the breast-plate, upon its border, which *was* on the side of the ephod inward. 20. And they made two *other* golden rings, and put them on the two [2]shoulder-pieces of the ephod underneath, toward the fore-part of it, over against its joining, above the band of the ephod. 21. And they fastened the breast-plate by its rings to the rings of the ephod with a ribbon of blue, that *it* might be above the band of the ephod, and that the breast-plate might not be loosed from the ephod; as the Lord commanded Moses.—22. And he made the robe of the ephod

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—"Twisted in the manner of ropes," omitted. [2] Sides.

22 וַיַּ֛עַשׂ אֶת־מְעִ֥יל הָאֵפֹ֖ד מַעֲשֵׂ֣ה אֹרֵ֑ג כְּלִ֖יל תְּכֵֽלֶת׃ 23 וּפִֽי־הַמְּעִ֥יל
בְּתוֹכ֖וֹ כְּפִ֣י תַחְרָ֑א שָׂפָ֥ה לְפִ֛יו סָבִ֖יב לֹ֥א יִקָּרֵֽעַ׃ 24 וַֽיַּעֲשׂוּ֙ עַל־
שׁוּלֵ֣י הַמְּעִ֔יל רִמּוֹנֵ֕י תְּכֵ֥לֶת וְאַרְגָּמָ֖ן וְתוֹלַ֣עַת שָׁנִ֑י מָשְׁזָֽר׃
25 וַיַּעֲשׂ֥וּ פַעֲמֹנֵ֖י זָהָ֣ב טָה֑וֹר וַיִּתְּנ֨וּ אֶת־הַפַּעֲמֹנִ֜ים בְּת֣וֹךְ
הָרִמֹּנִ֗ים עַל־שׁוּלֵ֤י הַמְּעִיל֙ סָבִ֔יב בְּת֖וֹךְ הָרִמֹּנִֽים׃ 26 פַּעֲמֹ֤ן וְרִמֹּן֙
פַּעֲמֹ֣ן וְרִמֹּ֔ן עַל־שׁוּלֵ֥י הַמְּעִ֖יל סָבִ֑יב לְשָׁרֵ֕ת כַּאֲשֶׁ֛ר צִוָּ֥ה יְהוָ֖ה
אֶת־מֹשֶֽׁה׃ ס 27 וַיַּעֲשׂ֛וּ אֶת־הַכָּתְנֹ֥ת שֵׁ֖שׁ מַעֲשֵׂ֣ה אֹרֵ֑ג
לְאַהֲרֹ֖ן וּלְבָנָֽיו׃ 28 וְאֵת֙ הַמִּצְנֶ֣פֶת שֵׁ֔שׁ וְאֶת־פַּאֲרֵ֥י הַמִּגְבָּעֹ֖ת שֵׁ֑שׁ
וְאֶת־מִכְנְסֵ֥י הַבָּ֖ד שֵׁ֥שׁ מָשְׁזָֽר׃ 29 וְאֶת־הָ֠אַבְנֵט שֵׁ֨שׁ מָשְׁזָ֜ר
וּתְכֵ֧לֶת וְאַרְגָּמָ֛ן וְתוֹלַ֥עַת שָׁנִ֖י מַעֲשֵׂ֣ה רֹקֵ֑ם כַּאֲשֶׁ֛ר צִוָּ֥ה יְהוָ֖ה
אֶת־מֹשֶֽׁה׃ ס 30 וַיַּעֲשׂ֛וּ אֶת־צִ֥יץ נֵֽזֶר־הַקֹּ֖דֶשׁ זָהָ֣ב טָה֑וֹר
וַיִּכְתְּב֣וּ עָלָ֗יו מִכְתַּב֙ פִּתּוּחֵ֣י חוֹתָ֔ם קֹ֖דֶשׁ לַיהוָֽה׃ 31 וַיִּתְּנ֤וּ עָלָיו֙ פְּתִ֣יל
תְּכֵ֔לֶת לָתֵ֥ת עַל־הַמִּצְנֶ֖פֶת מִלְמָ֑עְלָה כַּאֲשֶׁ֛ר צִוָּ֥ה יְהוָ֖ה אֶת־
מֹשֶֽׁה׃ ס 32 וַתֵּ֕כֶל כָּל־עֲבֹדַ֕ת מִשְׁכַּ֖ן אֹ֣הֶל מוֹעֵ֑ד
וַיַּעֲשׂוּ֙ בְּנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל כְּכֹל֩ אֲשֶׁ֨ר צִוָּ֧ה יְהוָ֛ה אֶת־מֹשֶׁ֖ה כֵּ֥ן
עָשֽׂוּ׃ פ רביעי
33 וַיָּבִ֤יאוּ אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן֙ אֶל־מֹשֶׁ֔ה אֶת־הָאֹ֖הֶל וְאֶת־כָּל־כֵּלָ֑יו קְרָסָ֣יו
קְרָשָׁ֔יו בְּרִיחָ֖ו וְעַמֻּדָ֥יו וַאֲדָנָֽיו׃ 34 וְאֶת־מִכְסֵ֞ה עוֹרֹ֤ת הָֽאֵילִם֙
הַמְאָדָּמִ֔ים וְאֶת־מִכְסֵ֖ה עֹרֹ֣ת הַתְּחָשִׁ֑ים וְאֵ֖ת פָּרֹ֥כֶת הַמָּסָֽךְ׃
35 אֶת־אֲר֥וֹן הָעֵדֻ֖ת וְאֶת־בַּדָּ֑יו וְאֵ֖ת הַכַּפֹּֽרֶת׃ 36 אֶת־הַשֻּׁלְחָן֙
אֶת־כָּל־כֵּלָ֔יו וְאֵ֖ת לֶ֥חֶם הַפָּנִֽים׃ 37 אֶת־הַמְּנֹרָ֨ה הַטְּהֹרָ֜ה אֶת־
נֵרֹתֶ֗יהָ נֵרֹ֛ת הַמַּעֲרָכָ֖ה וְאֶת־כָּל־כֵּלֶ֑יהָ וְאֵ֖ת שֶׁ֥מֶן הַמָּאֽוֹר׃
38 וְאֵת֙ מִזְבַּ֣ח הַזָּהָ֔ב וְאֵת֙ שֶׁ֣מֶן הַמִּשְׁחָ֔ה וְאֵ֖ת קְטֹ֣רֶת הַסַּמִּ֑ים
וְאֵ֕ת מָסַ֖ךְ פֶּ֥תַח הָאֹֽהֶל׃ 39 אֵ֣ת ׀ מִזְבַּ֣ח הַנְּחֹ֗שֶׁת וְאֶת־מִכְבַּ֤ר
הַנְּחֹ֙שֶׁת֙ אֲשֶׁר־ל֔וֹ אֶת־בַּדָּ֖יו וְאֶת־כָּל־כֵּלָ֑יו אֶת־הַכִּיֹּ֖ר וְאֶת־כַּנּֽוֹ׃
40 אֵת֩ קַלְעֵ֨י הֶחָצֵ֜ר אֶת־עַמֻּדֶ֣יהָ וְאֶת־אֲדָנֶ֗יהָ וְאֶת־הַמָּסָךְ֙ לְשַׁ֣עַר

ס בריחיו קרי

of woven work, all *of* blue. 23. And *there was* an opening in the midst of the robe, like the opening of a coat of mail, *with* a border round about the opening, that it should not be rent. 24. And they made upon the hem of the robe pomegranates *of* blue, and red, and crimson, *and* twined *linen.* 25. And they made bells *of* pure gold, and put the bells between the pomegranates upon the hem of the robe, round about between the pomegranates; 26. A bell and a pomegranate, a bell and a pomegranate, round about the hem of the robe, to minister *in it;* as the Lord commanded Moses.— 27. And they made the tunics *of* fine linen, *of* woven work, for Aaron and for his sons; 28. And the mitre *of* fine linen, and the beautiful turbans *of* fine linen, and the linen drawers *of* fine twined linen; 29. And the girdle *of* fine twined linen, and blue, and red, and crimson, *of* the work of the embroiderer; as the Lord commanded Moses.—30. And they made the plate of the holy crown *of* pure gold, and wrote upon it a writing, *like the* engravings of a signet, HOLINESS TO THE LORD. 31. And they tied to it a ribbon of blue, to put *it* on the mitre above; as the Lord commanded Moses.—32. Thus was all the work of the habitation of the Tent of Meeting finished: and the children of Israel did according to all which the Lord had commanded Moses, so they did. 33. And they brought the habitation to Moses, the tent, and all its vessels, its taches, its boards, its bars, and its pillars, and its sockets; 34. And the covering of rams' skins dyed red, and the covering of badgers' skins, and the vail for the hanging; 35. The ark of the testimony, and its staves and the mercy-seat; 36. The table, *and* all its vessels, and the shew-bread; 37. The pure candlestick, *with* its lamps, the lamps to be arranged in order, and all its vessels, and the oil for the light; 38. And the golden altar, and the anointing oil, and the incense of perfumes, and the hanging for the door of the Tabernacle; 39. The brazen altar, and its grate of brass, its staves, and all its vessels, the laver and its base; 40. The hangings of the Court, its pillars, and its sockets, and the

הֶחָצֵר אֶת־מֵיתָרָיו וִיתֵדֹתֶיהָ וְאֵת כָּל־כְּלֵי עֲבֹדַת הַמִּשְׁכָּן
לְאֹהֶל מוֹעֵד׃ 41 אֶת־בִּגְדֵי הַשְּׂרָד לְשָׁרֵת בַּקֹּדֶשׁ אֶת־בִּגְדֵי
הַקֹּדֶשׁ לְאַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן וְאֶת־בִּגְדֵי בָנָיו לְכַהֵן׃ 42 כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה
יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה כֵּן עָשׂוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֵת כָּל־הָעֲבֹדָה׃ 43 וַיַּרְא
מֹשֶׁה אֶת־כָּל־הַמְּלָאכָה וְהִנֵּה עָשׂוּ אֹתָהּ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה כֵּן עָשׂוּ
וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָם מֹשֶׁה׃ פ חמישי (שביעי כשהן מחוברין)

מ 1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 2 בְּיוֹם־הַחֹדֶשׁ הָרִאשׁוֹן
בְּאֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ תָּקִים אֶת־מִשְׁכַּן אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד׃ 3 וְשַׂמְתָּ שָׁם אֵת
אֲרוֹן הָעֵדוּת וְסַכֹּתָ עַל־הָאָרֹן אֶת־הַפָּרֹכֶת׃ 4 וְהֵבֵאתָ אֶת־הַשֻּׁלְחָן
וְעָרַכְתָּ אֶת־עֶרְכּוֹ וְהֵבֵאתָ אֶת־הַמְּנֹרָה וְהַעֲלֵיתָ אֶת־נֵרֹתֶיהָ׃
5 וְנָתַתָּה אֶת־מִזְבַּח הַזָּהָב לִקְטֹרֶת לִפְנֵי אֲרוֹן הָעֵדֻת וְשַׂמְתָּ
אֶת־מָסַךְ הַפֶּתַח לַמִּשְׁכָּן׃ 6 וְנָתַתָּה אֵת מִזְבַּח הָעֹלָה לִפְנֵי פֶּתַח
מִשְׁכַּן אֹהֶל־מוֹעֵד׃ 7 וְנָתַתָּ אֶת־הַכִּיֹּר בֵּין־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וּבֵין הַמִּזְבֵּחַ
וְנָתַתָּ שָׁם מָיִם׃ 8 וְשַׂמְתָּ אֶת־הֶחָצֵר סָבִיב וְנָתַתָּ אֶת־מָסַךְ שַׁעַר
הֶחָצֵר׃ 9 וְלָקַחְתָּ אֶת־שֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה וּמָשַׁחְתָּ אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן
וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־בּוֹ וְקִדַּשְׁתָּ אֹתוֹ וְאֶת־כָּל־כֵּלָיו וְהָיָה קֹדֶשׁ׃
10 וּמָשַׁחְתָּ אֶת־מִזְבַּח הָעֹלָה וְאֶת־כָּל־כֵּלָיו וְקִדַּשְׁתָּ אֶת־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ
וְהָיָה הַמִּזְבֵּחַ קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים׃ 11 וּמָשַׁחְתָּ אֶת־הַכִּיֹּר וְאֶת־כַּנּוֹ
וְקִדַּשְׁתָּ אֹתוֹ׃ 12 וְהִקְרַבְתָּ אֶת־אַהֲרֹן וְאֶת־בָּנָיו אֶל־פֶּתַח אֹהֶל
מוֹעֵד וְרָחַצְתָּ אֹתָם בַּמָּיִם׃ 13 וְהִלְבַּשְׁתָּ אֶת־אַהֲרֹן אֵת בִּגְדֵי

CHAPTER XL.

2. On the first day (באחד לחדש) of the first month after the departure from Egypt, or one year less fourteen days after this event, the Tabernacle was reared up. In ver. 17, the Samaritan codex adds, indeed, לצאתם ממצרים, and the Septuagint, πορευομένων αὐτῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου. ביום is, therefore, on *the* day, the day κατ' ἐξοχήν, that is, the first day.

3. The vail which "covers the ark," is that which separates the Holy of Holies from the Holy; compare ver. 21. Therefore פרכת is here the correct reading,

hanging for the gate of the Court, its cords, and its pins, and all the vessels of the service of the habitation for the Tent of the Meeting; 41. The garments of office to do service in the holy *place*, [1]the holy garments for Aaron the priest, and his sons' garments, to serve as the priests. 42. According to all that the Lord had commanded Moses, so the children of Israel made all the work. 43. And Moses saw all the work, and, behold, they had done it as the Lord had commanded, even so had they done it: and Moses blessed them.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—And the holy garments.

CHAP. XL. 1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. On the first day of the first month shalt thou rear the habitation of the Tent of Meeting. 3. And thou shalt put therein the ark of the testimony, [2]and hang the vail before the ark. 4. And thou shalt bring in the table, and set in order the things which are to be set in order upon it; and thou shalt bring in the candlestick, and put on its lamps. 5. And thou shalt place the altar of gold for the incense before the ark of the testimony, and put the hanging of the door on the habitation. 6. And thou shalt place the altar of the burnt-offering before the door of the habitation of the Tent of Meeting. 7. And thou shalt place the laver between the Tent of Meeting and the altar, and shalt put water therein. 8. And thou shalt erect the Court round about, and put the hanging at the Court gate. 9. And thou shalt take the anointing oil, and anoint the Tabernacle, and all that *is* therein, and shalt hallow it, and all its vessels; and it shall be holy. 10. And thou shalt anoint the altar of burnt-offering, and all its vessels, and hallow the altar; and it shall be an altar most holy. 11. And thou shalt anoint the laver and its base, and hallow it. 12. And thou shalt bring Aaron and his sons to the door of the Tent of Meeting, and wash them with water. 13. And thou shalt clothe Aaron in the holy garments, and anoint him, and sanctify him; that he

[2] *Engl. Vers.*—And cover the ark with the vail.

הַקֹּ֑דֶשׁ וּמָשַׁחְתָּ֥ אֹת֛וֹ וְקִדַּשְׁתָּ֥ אֹת֖וֹ וְכִהֵ֥ן לִֽי׃ 14 וְאֶת־בָּנָ֖יו תַּקְרִ֑יב
וְהִלְבַּשְׁתָּ֥ אֹתָ֖ם כֻּתֳּנֹֽת׃ 15 וּמָשַׁחְתָּ֣ אֹתָ֗ם כַּאֲשֶׁ֤ר מָשַׁ֙חְתָּ֙ אֶת־אֲבִיהֶ֔ם
וְכִהֲנ֖וּ לִ֑י וְהָ֨יְתָ֜ה לִהְיֹ֨ת לָהֶ֧ם מָשְׁחָתָ֛ם לִכְהֻנַּ֥ת עוֹלָ֖ם לְדֹרֹתָֽם׃
16 וַיַּ֖עַשׂ מֹשֶׁ֑ה כְּ֠כֹל אֲשֶׁ֨ר צִוָּ֧ה יְהוָ֛ה אֹת֖וֹ כֵּ֥ן עָשָֽׂה׃ ס ששי 17 וַיְהִ֞י
בַּחֹ֧דֶשׁ הָרִאשׁ֛וֹן בַּשָּׁנָ֥ה הַשֵּׁנִ֖ית בְּאֶחָ֣ד לַחֹ֑דֶשׁ הוּקַ֖ם הַמִּשְׁכָּֽן׃
18 וַיָּ֨קֶם מֹשֶׁ֜ה אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּ֗ן וַיִּתֵּן֙ אֶת־אֲדָנָ֔יו וַיָּ֙שֶׂם֙ אֶת־קְרָשָׁ֔יו וַיִּתֵּ֖ן
אֶת־בְּרִיחָ֑יו וַיָּ֖קֶם אֶת־עַמּוּדָֽיו׃ 19 וַיִּפְרֹ֤שׂ אֶת־הָאֹ֙הֶל֙ עַל־הַמִּשְׁכָּ֔ן
וַיָּ֜שֶׂם אֶת־מִכְסֵ֥ה הָאֹ֛הֶל עָלָ֖יו מִלְמָ֑עְלָה כַּאֲשֶׁ֛ר צִוָּ֥ה יְהוָ֖ה אֶת־
מֹשֶֽׁה׃ ס 20 וַיִּקַּ֞ח וַיִּתֵּ֤ן אֶת־הָֽעֵדֻת֙ אֶל־הָ֣אָרֹ֔ן
וַיָּ֥שֶׂם אֶת־הַבַּדִּ֖ים עַל־הָאָרֹ֑ן וַיִּתֵּ֧ן אֶת־הַכַּפֹּ֛רֶת עַל־הָאָרֹ֖ן מִלְמָֽעְלָה׃
21 וַיָּבֵ֣א אֶת־הָאָרֹן֮ אֶל־הַמִּשְׁכָּן֒ וַיָּ֗שֶׂם אֵ֚ת פָּרֹ֣כֶת הַמָּסָ֔ךְ וַיָּ֕סֶךְ עַ֖ל
אֲר֣וֹן הָעֵד֑וּת כַּאֲשֶׁ֛ר צִוָּ֥ה יְהוָ֖ה אֶת־מֹשֶֽׁה׃ ס 22 וַיִּתֵּ֤ן
אֶת־הַשֻּׁלְחָן֙ בְּאֹ֣הֶל מוֹעֵ֔ד עַ֛ל יֶ֥רֶךְ הַמִּשְׁכָּ֖ן צָפֹ֑נָה מִח֖וּץ לַפָּרֹֽכֶת׃
23 וַיַּעֲרֹ֥ךְ עָלָ֛יו עֵ֥רֶךְ לֶ֖חֶם לִפְנֵ֣י יְהוָ֑ה כַּאֲשֶׁ֛ר צִוָּ֥ה יְהוָ֖ה אֶת־
מֹשֶֽׁה׃ ס 24 וַיָּ֤שֶׂם אֶת־הַמְּנֹרָה֙ בְּאֹ֣הֶל מוֹעֵ֔ד נֹ֖כַח
הַשֻּׁלְחָ֑ן עַ֛ל יֶ֥רֶךְ הַמִּשְׁכָּ֖ן נֶֽגְבָּה׃ 25 וַיַּ֥עַל הַנֵּרֹ֖ת לִפְנֵ֣י יְהוָ֑ה כַּאֲשֶׁ֛ר
צִוָּ֥ה יְהוָ֖ה אֶת־מֹשֶֽׁה׃ ס 26 וַיָּ֛שֶׂם
אֶת־מִזְבַּ֥ח הַזָּהָ֖ב בְּאֹ֣הֶל מוֹעֵ֑ד לִפְנֵ֖י הַפָּרֹֽכֶת׃ 27 וַיַּקְטֵ֥ר עָלָ֖יו
קְטֹ֣רֶת סַמִּ֑ים כַּאֲשֶׁ֛ר צִוָּ֥ה יְהוָ֖ה אֶת־מֹשֶֽׁה׃ ס שביעי 28 וַיָּ֛שֶׂם
אֶת־מָסַ֥ךְ הַפֶּ֖תַח לַמִּשְׁכָּֽן׃ 29 וְאֵת֙ מִזְבַּ֣ח הָעֹלָ֔ה שָׂ֕ם פֶּ֖תַח מִשְׁכַּ֣ן
אֹֽהֶל־מוֹעֵ֑ד וַיַּ֣עַל עָלָ֗יו אֶת־הָֽעֹלָה֙ וְאֶת־הַמִּנְחָ֔ה כַּאֲשֶׁ֛ר צִוָּ֥ה יְהוָ֖ה
אֶת־מֹשֶֽׁה׃ ס 30 וַיָּ֙שֶׂם֙ אֶת־הַכִּיֹּ֔ר בֵּֽין־אֹ֥הֶל מוֹעֵ֖ד וּבֵ֣ין
הַמִּזְבֵּ֑חַ וַיִּתֵּ֥ן שָׁ֛מָּה מַ֖יִם לְרָחְצָֽה׃ 31 וְרָחֲצ֣וּ מִמֶּ֔נּוּ מֹשֶׁ֖ה וְאַהֲרֹ֣ן

not כפרת, which the Samaritan text contains, and Targum Jonathan expresses.

15. Whilst every successive High-priest was to be anointed in the same manner as Aaron had been anointed, the common priests required, later, no unction, but only a consecration; with the sons of Aaron all their descendants were anointed for all futurity.

23—31. The ceremonies here described, were performed by Moses only

may serve me as priest. 14. And thou shalt bring his sons, and clothe them with tunics; 15. And thou shalt anoint them, as thou hast anointed their father, that they may serve me as priests: for their anointing shall certainly be for an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations. 16. Thus did Moses; according to all that the Lord had commanded him, so he did.—17. And it was in the first month of the second year, on the first *day* of the month, *that* the Tabernacle was reared up. 18. And Moses reared the habitation, and placed its sockets, and set up its boards, and fastened its bars, and reared up its pillars. 19. And he spread the tent over the habitation, and put the covering of the tent above upon it; as the Lord had commanded Moses. 20. And he took and placed the testimony in the ark, and set the staves on the ark, and put the mercy-seat above the ark: 21. And he brought the ark into the Tabernacle, and set up the vail of the covering, and hung *it* before the ark of the testimony; as the Lord had commanded Moses. 22. And he placed the table in the Tent of Meeting, upon the side of the Tabernacle northward, without the vail. 23. And he arranged the bread in order upon it before the Lord; as the Lord had commanded Moses. 24. And he put the candlestick in the Tent of Meeting over against the table, on the side of the Tabernacle southward. 25. And he put on the lamps before the Lord; as the Lord commanded Moses. 26. And he put the golden altar in the Tent of Meeting before the vail: 27. And he burnt incense of perfumes thereon; as the Lord had commanded Moses. 28. And he put the hanging of the door before the Tabernacle. 29. And he put the altar of burnt-offering *before* the door of the habitation of the Tent of Meeting, and offered upon it the burnt-offering and the meat-offering; as the Lord had commanded Moses. 30. And he set the laver between the Tent of Meeting and the altar, and put water there for washing. 31. And Moses and Aaron and his

after the Tabernacle was erected and anointed, during the seven days of consecration; on the eighth day the priests themselves undertook these functions,

וּבָנָיו אֶת־יְדֵיהֶם וְאֶת־רַגְלֵיהֶם׃ 32 בְּבֹאָם אֶל־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד
וּבְקָרְבָתָם אֶל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ יִרְחָצוּ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־
מֹשֶׁה׃ ס 33 וַיָּקֶם אֶת־הֶחָצֵר סָבִיב לַמִּשְׁכָּן וְלַמִּזְבֵּחַ וַיִּתֵּן
אֶת־מָסַךְ שַׁעַר הֶחָצֵר וַיְכַל מֹשֶׁה אֶת־הַמְּלָאכָה׃ פ מפטיר
34 וַיְכַס הֶעָנָן אֶת־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וּכְבוֹד יְהוָה מָלֵא אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן׃
35 וְלֹא־יָכֹל מֹשֶׁה לָבוֹא אֶל־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד כִּי־שָׁכַן עָלָיו הֶעָנָן
וּכְבוֹד יְהוָה מָלֵא אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן׃ 36 וּבְהֵעָלוֹת הֶעָנָן מֵעַל הַמִּשְׁכָּן
יִסְעוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּכֹל מַסְעֵיהֶם׃ 37 וְאִם־לֹא יֵעָלֶה הֶעָנָן וְלֹא
יִסְעוּ עַד־יוֹם הֵעָלֹתוֹ׃ 38 כִּי עֲנַן יְהוָה עַל־הַמִּשְׁכָּן יוֹמָם וְאֵשׁ
תִּהְיֶה לַיְלָה בּוֹ לְעֵינֵי כָל־בֵּית־יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּכָל־מַסְעֵיהֶם׃

חזק

from which Moses then for ever abstained (see Levit. viii. ix).

34—38. The same cloud (הענן) which was to the Israelites, since their exodus from Egypt, a sign and pledge of Divine protection (xiii. 21; xiv. 19, 20; xvi. 9, 10), covered now the holy Tent; the glory of the Lord filled it so completely that Moses was unable to enter (compare 1 Kings viii. 10, 11); this was for the people a guarantee that God intended to dwell among them (xxix. 44); that He had again accepted them as His "peculiar treasure;" only when the cloud had withdrawn to the Holy of Holies, Moses could approach God and commune with Him. This cloud was at the same time a signal for the journeys of Israel; when it rested over the Tabernacle, they encamped; when it rose from it, they continued their marches, as is more fully described in Numb. ix. 17—22. This notice is here, by anticipation, inserted from the same principle, which guided the sacred historian in the remark contained in xvi. 35; he frequently combines the facts bearing on the same subject to one complete narrative; he writes no chronicle, but a pragmatical history. But further, the contents of these verses point, on the one hand, to the journeys detailed in the fourth Book, whilst they are, on the other hand, closely connected with Leviticus, where the whole organization of the Sanctuary and of priestdom is described: the Books of the Law are not only individually in harmony with their parts, but they form collectively a work internally pervaded by the spirit of unity and order.

The history of the Tabernacle may thus be traced. During the journeys of the Israelites, its various parts and utensils were carefully wrapped up and carried by the Levites (Numb. iv.), who erected it again when the Israelites encamped. In the time of Joshua it was brought to Shiloh (Josh. xviii. 1; xix. 51), where it remained during the whole period of the Judges, and where annually the great national festivals were celebrated; it was considered as the only legitimate sanc-

sons washed their hands and their feet thereat; 32. When they went into the Tent of Meeting, and when they approached the altar, they washed; as the Lord had commanded Moses. 33. And he reared up the Court round about the Tabernacle and the altar, and set up the hanging of the Court gate. So Moses finished the work.—34. Then the cloud covered the Tent of Meeting, and the glory of the Lord filled the habitation. 35. And Moses was not able to enter into the Tent of Meeting, for the cloud rested on it, and the glory of the Lord filled the habitation. 36. And when the cloud [1]arose from the Tabernacle, the children of Israel went onward in all their journeys: 37. But if the cloud did not arise, then they did not journey till the day that it arose. 38. For the cloud of the Lord *was* upon the Tabernacle by day, and fire was on it by night, in the sight of all the house of Israel, throughout all their journeys.

[1] *Engl. Vers.*—Was taken up.

tuary (Josh. xxii.; Judg. xviii. 31; xxi. 19; 1 Sam. i. 3; iii. 3, etc.), although other holy places of public assembly are mentioned from the lifetime of Joshua down to the period of the kings, as Shechem, Gilgal, Mizpah, and Bethel (Josh. xxiv. 26; Judg. xx. 1, 26, etc.). After the great victory of the Philistines in the time of Eli, the Tabernacle was removed to Nob, likewise in the territory of Benjamin (1 Sam. xxi.); but was, after the destruction of this town (xxii.), brought to Gibeon, where we meet it in the time of David and Solomon (1 Chron. xvi. 39; xxi. 29; 1 Kings iii. 4; ix. 2, etc.). The latter king ordered it to be brought to Jerusalem, and, with all its vessels, to be deposited in the temple (1 Kings viii. 4). From this time it is no more mentioned in the sacred records. — The equally changeful fate of the Ark of the Covenant will be adverted to in its proper place.

So, then, had the descendants of Jacob advanced a most momentous step; we found them, at the beginning of this book, as an increasing multitude of ill-treated and idolatrous slaves; we leave them as a free nation, the guardians of eternal truth, the witnesses of overwhelming miracles. Released from the vain and buisy worldliness of proud Egypt, they encamp in the silent desert, in isolated and solemn solitude, holding converse only with their thoughts and with their God. Before them stood erected the visible habitation of Him whom they acknowledged and adored as their rescuer from Egyptian thraldom; the mysterious structure disclosed to them many profound ideas of their new religion; and they respected the priests as their representatives and their mediators. The communion between God and His people was opened; the pious might preserve, the penitent sinner might restore the harmony of the mind; life had its aim, and virtue its guide.

ADDITIONS.

To p. xxxi.

The origin and character of the *Christians* are not treated with greater consideration by Tacitus, who narrates (Ann. xv. 44), that Nero charged with having caused the conflagration of Rome, "quos *per flagitia invisos* vulgus Christianos appellabat. Auctor nominis ejus Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat; repressaque in praesens *exitiabilis superstitio* rursus erumpebat, non modo per Judaeam, originem *ejus mali*, sed per urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique *atrocia aut pudenda* confluunt celebranturque." We find here, in an unusually repulsive form, the same inveterate animosity and blind hatred, which the heathens felt against all those who professed other religious opinions, or followed different rites and ceremonies. The Christians were, indeed, long held in the same abhorrence as the Jews, from whom they had sprung; and the persecution which Claudius ordered against the Jews, included, as a matter of course, the Christians likewise.

To p. 63.

Ewald (Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. p. 89) is of opinion that Sinai is the earlier, Horeb the later name. But if this is the case, did both peaks, the northern and the southern one, bear *the same name?* And what are the reasons which Ewald adduces for this opinion? "Deborah (Jud. v. 5) uses the name of Sinai, whereas that of Horeb is not found earlier than—Exod. iii. 1; xvii. 6, etc.," for that critic assigns these portions of Exodus to the "fourth historian" of the Pentateuch.—For those who are familiar with Ewald's theory of analyzing, or rather anatomizing, the sacred books, this remark requires no elucidation.—However, it is evident from xvii. 6, compared with xix. 1, 20, that Horeb designates the whole region, since already during the encampment of the Hebrews in Rephidim, Moses stood "on a rock in Horeb," but that Sinai is the name of the highest mountain of that region, on which the revelation took place.

To p. 145.

הֵתִלְּתָּ (in Judges xvi. 10) is used instead of הֵתִלֹּתָ, and is formed from הֵתֵל, as הוֹשַׁבְתָּ from הוֹשִׁיב.—The form תְּהָתֵלּוּ instead of the contraction תְּתֵלּוּ, is a Chaldaism which occurs both in regular and irregular verbs (especially פ״י); for instance, מְהֻקְצָעוֹת (Ezek. xlvi. 22); יְהוֹשִׁיעַ (1 Sam. xvii. 47); יְהוֹדֶה (Neh. xi. 17); and even in proper names, as יְהוֹסֵף (Ps. lxxxi. 6); see *Gesen.*, Lehrg. p. 323, 386.—The root תלל is kindred with the Chaldee טלל, from which the frequently used substantive איטלולא, *irrision*, is used; compare *S. D. Luzzato* on Isaiah xxx. 10, in *Rosenmüller's* Scholia in Vet. Test. in Compendium Redacta II. xix.—Another instance of compensating a long vowel by a dagesh forte is in 1 Sam. ii. 8: יְנַחִלֵּם, instead of ינחילם.

To p. 205.

Royle (in *Kitto's* Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit. ii. p. 976) believes the hyssop of the Bible to be identical with the *caper-plant* (capparis spinosa), called in Arabic *asuf*, which grows in several valleys about Mount Sinai, "creeping up the mountain side like a parasitic plant, its branches covered with small thorns." But although Royle's demonstration is admirable for its logical precision, he does not succeed to raise his opinion beyond a vague hypothesis, the principal support of which is an accidental, but often illusory, resemblance of names.

To p. 232.

Another interpretation of חֲמֻשִׁים is "divided into five sections," namely the centre, the right and left wings, the van, and the rear, which was the usual arrangement of the Oriental armies; see *Freytag*, Chrestom. Arab. p. 120; *Ewald*, Geschichte des Volkes Israel ii. p. 54, note. If we, indeed, connect חמוש with the number חמש, it must soon have lost that original meaning, and received the general signification of *armed, arrayed* for battle, as is clear from Josh. i. 14; iv. 12. But the obvious analogy of חמוש and חלוץ, Josh. iv. 12 and 13, seems to be more in favour of the acceptation adopted by us.

To p. 249.

Ewald proposes to read in ver. 20, וְהֶחֱשִׁךְ instead of וְהַחֹשֶׁךְ, and translates: "and it came to pass that the cloud both caused darkness and illumined the night." If this supposition is confined to a mere change of the vowels (although the correspondence with the following ויאר would require ויחשך), it is impossible to admit another conjecture of the same sagacious critic, adopting in ver. 25 the reading of the Samaritan codex ויאסר instead of ויסר, and explaining נהג in the sense of "paralyzing, weakening"; that alteration is unnecessary, whilst this meaning of נהג is questionable; for it is an unsupported assertion, that it signifies in Eccl. ii. 3, "to be loth or weary."

To p. 281 (Ver. 25).

Still farther from the truth is the acceptation of those who take חק ומשפט in the sense of "oracle and decision," so that this passage would imply, that a perpetual oracle assisted Moses in carrying out his plans, or that a prophetic voice guided Israel during the journeys. The emphatical repetition of the adverb שם: "*There* God made for them חק ומשפט, and *there* He tried them," shows clearly that our text does not allude to a permanent prophecy, but to one single admonition at a certain time. And although משפט is used in the signification of decision, in the term חשן משפט (see p. 541); חק alone does not signify oracle, but law, statute, or edict (from חקק, to appoint, or decree, originally to engrave or inscribe).

To p. 586.

The attributes of God, are:—

יי יי, The Eternal is the Eternal; that is, as the Talmud (Rosh Hash. 17, *b*) explains it: "I am יי before man sins, and I am יי after he has sinned and repented," He does not chastise for ever; His loving-kindness changes not.

אל, He is all-powerful, Lord of the Universe, ruler of nature and mankind; might and glory belong to Him alone.

רחום, merciful, full of affectionate sympathy for the sufferings of human frailty; looking with feeling compassion on the imperfections, the aberrations, and the miseries of mankind.

חנון, gracious, assisting and helping wherever aid is necessary, consoling the afflicted and raising up the oppressed.

ארך אפים, long-suffering, not hastening to punish the sinner immediately after his transgression, but leaving him time, and affording him opportunities to retrace his evil course. Mendelssohn explains the three last epithets thus: "He who is moved with compassion when he sees the misery of others, is called מרחם; and if he is thereby urged on disinterestedly to assist the sufferers, he is חונן.... But God alone is רחום וחנון, whilst man is only מרחם וחונן; and in the same manner the former only is ארך אפים, the latter merely מאריך אף." This distinction seems to signify, that in God alone those qualities are permanent, inherent, and necessary attributes; while in man they manifest themselves only temporarily, on certain occasions, and not as a spontaneous emanation of his nature.

רב חסד, abundant in goodness, granting His gifts and blessings beyond the desert of man; not distributing his bounties with cold and rigid justice, but prompted by kindness, and by the desire of beatifying His creatures.

ואמת, full of truth, not only recompensing the pious as He has promised, but eternally true to Himself, pursuing His sublime and inscrutable schemes for the salvation of mankind; faithfully governing the world in accordance with the truths revealed by Him.

נצר חסד לאלפים, keeping mercy for thousands, remembering the good deeds of the ancestors to the thousandth generation (xx. 6); reserving reward and recompensation to the remotest descendants.

נשא עון ופשע וחטאה, pardoning every transgression; bearing with indulgence the sins of man, and by forgiveness restoring him to the original purity of his soul. The Rabbins (*Talm.* Jom. 36 *b*) distinguish עון as the sin committed from evil disposition (זדונות); פשע, from malice and spirit of opposition (מרדים), and חטאה, from error or heedlessness (שגגות). God is ever ready to pardon all transgressions, either springing up from a corrupt heart or careless unconsciousness of the snares surrounding the path of virtue.

ונקה לא ינקה. However, as man is a free agent, as he is responsible for his deeds, and as he possesses a spirit capable of discerning between right and wrong, God cannot leave entirely unpunished repeated wickedness and obstinate persistence in evil; His goodness cannot destroy His justice; He is often compelled to inflict chastisement to reform the sinner; man is to gain salvation by exerting his innate divine powers; he is to strive after the purity of God with perseverance and zeal; but in these exertions he can be certain of God's gracious assistance; the incompetency of man is aided by a superior power; and the justice of God is as much tempered by kindness, as His kindness is kept in constant equipoise by His paternal severity. Another interpretation of ונקה לא ינקה, and of the following פקד עון אבות וכ׳, see on p. 349.

FINIS.

WERTHEIMER AND CO., PRINTERS, CIRCUS-PLACE, FINSBURY.